

PUBLISHED UNDER THE DIRECTION OF THE BOARD OF CENSORS.

BOSTON:

207

LZ 13

A51

1868

S. CHISM, — Franklin Printing, Lodge, 132 Washington Street.

CONTENTS.

JOURNAL OF PROCEEDINGS.

ADDRESSES.	5
DISCUSSION: "Defects in our Present System of Education." . .	15
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION: Address of Henry Barnard, LL.D. .	48
DISCUSSION: "The Elementary Study of the English Language." .	58
DISCUSSION: "The True Order of Studies."	72
DISCUSSION: "The Course of Study in Grammar Schools." . . .	76
LIST OF OFFICERS.	100
DISCUSSION: "What Education should precede a Strictly Professional One?"	102
CLOSING EXERCISES.	111

LECTURES.

I. THE CLASSICAL QUESTION: By William C. Collar, of Boston. .	121
II. THE MEANS AND MANNER OF POPULAR EDUCATION: By Prof. John Bascom, of Williamstown.	157
III. SCHOOL RECORDS: By Elbridge Smith, of Dorchester. . . .	179

AMERICAN LEGATION OF THE CITY OF MEXICO

REPORT OF THE AMERICAN LEGATION OF THE CITY OF MEXICO
FOR THE YEAR 1891

The American Legation of the City of Mexico, during the year 1891, has been honored by the presence of several distinguished visitors, and has been able to render valuable assistance to the Government of Mexico in various matters of international interest. The Legation has also been able to maintain its relations with the American people, and to promote the interests of the United States in Mexico.

The Legation has been able to maintain its relations with the American people, and to promote the interests of the United States in Mexico. The Legation has also been able to render valuable assistance to the Government of Mexico in various matters of international interest.

AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF INSTRUCTION.

THIRTY-NINTH ANNUAL MEETING.

FIRST DAY'S PROCEEDINGS.

PITTSFIELD, MASS., August 5, 1868.

THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF INSTRUCTION commenced the first session of its thirty-ninth Annual Meeting in Burbank Hall, Pittsfield, at half-past two o'clock, P. M. The chair was occupied by the President, John Kneeland, of Boston. Prayer was offered by Rev. Dr. Strong, of Pittsfield.

ADDRESS OF WELCOME.

Dr. Root, Chairman of the School-Committee, in behalf of the citizens, then welcomed the Institute to Pittsfield. He said:—

Mr. President and Gentlemen, Members of the American Institute of Instruction:—The very agreeable duty has been assigned to me, to welcome you to our county and our town. In behalf, then, of those who are interested in the great cause of education—and who is not?—in behalf of all such, I now welcome you to our verdant hills, to our fertile valleys, to our sparkling, silver lakes, to our limpid and babbling brooks and large streams; I welcome you to our homes and to our hearts.

We, too, have had some thought, and given some attention to this great subject, the education of the youth and children

of this community ; recognizing, as you undoubtedly do, that education, in its broadest and most liberal sense, embracing a regard to the moral and physical as well as intellectual nature, is laying broad and deep the foundations for the defence and for the perpetuation of our noble free institutions. Patriotism, an enlightened patriotism, is one of the noblest virtues that ever stirred the human heart. And when in the great struggle of this nation for the defence of our government, where did this noble virtue first develop itself? First of all in the educated men of our land, in our professional men. The pulpit, the bar, and the medical practitioner, rushed to arms ; not for place, but for the privilege of standing up in defence of the country. Soon, it is true, very soon, from every place and position, the strength and manhood of our country followed after, and we exhibited to the world such an army as was never before seen, — an army of intellect, an army of cultivated and trained intellect. A foreigner, visiting the army, saw a common soldier reading "The Atlantic Monthly," and expressed his surprise at the fact of his giving attention to the reading of such an article as he was perusing. The soldier very modestly replied that he was just looking it over, as he had written it himself. There were many in our army who did write, and many more who might have written articles for any of the periodicals of the country.

We welcome you here, because we need your matured thought, your long experience, and your matured views on the subject of education. We live here, among the hills ; we are a great way from the Hub, and very likely you will discover that we shall have, in our manners, some of the roughness of the mountains among which we have been reared. I hope we shall not be found entirely wanting in their strength. The people of Berkshire are a sort of cross

between the descendants of the Netherlands and the Puritans. You will discover from our speech, without doubt, that we have had something to do with Nicholas Van Brummel and Peter Stuyvesant, our neighbors just over the border; and yet we have never given up the privilege of guessing, of asking questions, and of answering them, too, in the Yankee way.

We are not entirely destitute of experience in educational matters; and yet, living so far from the great centres, you will find us, on a careful examination, doubtless, to have been running in some of the older grooves or ruts, in which some of the earlier educators have directed our paths.

We have not much to brag of, and yet the few things that we have, we make the most of. We once had a "big elm tree," so high that if we flew our kites or rockets, or got our thoughts as high, we were perfectly satisfied: we never had any higher aspirations. But it is down, and we are now at sea.

We welcome you here, that we may get some other and better standard. You will find us, in the county of Berkshire, very much addicted to "spinning long yarns" and whittling. For confirmation of the first assertion, you have only to wander up and down our streams with some of the natives. For proof of the second, we whittled out the first carding-machine, the first spinning-jenny, the first broad-loom, and made the first yard of broadcloth ever made in this country; so that, whatever you may find us, we claim to have been among the earliest to lay aside "homespun" and put on broadcloth. (Applause.) We welcome you, gentlemen, because we are living here, far away from those centres where are found collected those matured thoughts which attract attention; yet we have boasted, generation after generation, that we had the first agricultural society, the first cattle-

show and fair that ever was held in the country. I know it is denied ; but we have said it so long that we believe it, and mean to stand to it. (Laughter.) I remember very well attending that cattle-show, and seeing one hundred yoke of oxen draw a plough which was held by a man more than ninety years old, though it took two men to hold up the ploughman. But that was a *cattle-show*, not one of the modern things, where a trotting-match, a foot-race, a greased pig, and a fandango constitute the staples.

We have some products about which we have a right to be proud. Berkshire has produced a Miss Catharine Sedgwick, a William Cullen Bryant, and a Mark Hopkins. (Applause.) And I might name others.

But, Mr. President and gentlemen, I did not rise to make a speech, but simply to extend to you, in behalf of the citizens of this town and county, our hearty and cordial welcome to Berkshire and Pittsfield.

RESPONSE BY THE PRESIDENT.

Permit me, sir, in behalf of the American Institute of Instruction, to heartily thank you, and those whom you represent, for the very agreeable invitation to meet in your town, and your kind and cordial words of welcome. It seems to us, since we came here, as if our geography must make some new division of the world, — one part outside of these hills and valleys, and the other this charming spot which is inclosed by them. We, outsiders, have already been gladdened to-day, by the genial welcome of your hills and valleys, and we are now only the more happy to receive the welcome of your words.

A quarter of a century ago, the American Institute of Instruction met in your town. There were present on that

occasion such men as Horace Mann, Cyrus Pierce, Gideon F. Thayer, and others like them, who have passed on to their reward. Verily, "there were giants in those days." We come to-day not as giants; yet when I look around me, I see many who are the lineal descendants of that race, many who are interested in the same great work which occupied their minds and hearts. But we come to confer together, and to enlighten each other, and stir up each other's minds, that we may in our day and generation do something to advance the great cause of education.

I would extend to you and your townsmen a cordial invitation to join with us in our discussions.

Again, sir, permit me to thank you for your cordial welcome.

ADDRESS TO THE INSTITUTE BY THE PRESIDENT.

Ladies and Gentlemen:—It has been customary for the presiding officer of this association, before inviting you to proceed with the business which has called you together, to say a few words, as a sort of introduction to the real work before you.

We are living in a very progressive age; in a very unsettled age. Nothing nowadays is taken for granted. Every custom, every mode of faith, is met at once by the fierce question, Why do you exist? By what authority do you demand aught of me? No matter how long the ancestral roll, how noble the lineage, how beneficent the influence, how glorious the victories, the authority is none the less questioned. Religion, government, philosophy, are met on our great highways, as well as in lanes and by-streets, by brazen, self-sufficient reason, and ordered to "stand and deliver, or die!"

It is sometimes amusing to listen to the haughty challenges of these modern Goliaths; yet they awaken consternation among the timid, and make many doubtful of the future. Shall what has been gained be lost, and modern Philistines ravage and trample the vineyards of God, or shall the Davids come as of old, with calm reliance upon an unchanging Providence to smite down these insolent ravagers with the simple truth.

While there is so much restlessness and discussion in the world, in regard to what concerns men most intimately, we cannot expect to till our educational fields unmolested, jogging along in the old manner, dropping in the same old seed in the same old way. There are voices all about us, crying, "Here! what are you about? Don't you know the world has progressed? We have done with the musty philosophy of the ancients; we care not what they thought or did, nor how they thought or did it. What is Parnassus to Pike's Peak, or Athens and Rome to New York and Chicago! Suppose the bees did gather honey on Hymettus two thousand years ago, and suppose it was very good honey in its day, there are myriads of bees now just as smart getting honey from our fields and forests,—and, besides all that, we know what honey is, and can make it in any quantity without waiting for the slow bees. So get out of the way with your subsoil plough and burly oxen. Why, with modern appliances, we will have a crop off your field, before you, with your old-fashioned, clumsy tools, can get it ready for planting!"

On the one side comes the word, Not so much of the dead far-off times; let us have the thoughts, the discoveries, the activities of the present: on the other, The roots of the present are in the past; the highest culture goes back to the golden age, studies the ancient models, and imbibes the classic spirit. Which shall we heed? Shall we compromise

the matter, and try to suit both? "Tom," says the landlord, "don't you give Mr. Smith's horse too much hay; you know he has oats." "Tom, mind you don't give Mr. Smith's horse too many oats; you know he has hay." A mode of reasoning not very satisfactory to the poor horse; and equally unsatisfactory to the student, who is the victim of a compromise between Greek and engineering.

But this question is striking deeper into our educational affairs, than the mere arraying of science against classics. On looking over the columns of a newspaper the other day, an article attracted my attention, which asserted that our schools would not be answering their full purpose till they sent every boy and girl out into the world with a knowledge of some kind of trade or employment, by which he could earn his living. Grammar, arithmetic, reading, are of small account in comparison with the ability to do some particular thing for a living. It reminded me of an old friend who argued stoutly that boys ought to be taught at school how to harness a horse, to which I of course assented, if the city would furnish a good horse and carriage for practice.

Now, I believe it is wise for the teacher to be open to suggestions, to believe the future has something good yet to be revealed, and to be on the lookout for it, and ready to receive it when it comes. When a man has reached that state in which he knows everything, and how to do everything, he ought to be translated to another sphere where he can have wider scope for his powers.

It has been stated that teachers are the most obstinate people in the world. There is no class in the community so thoroughly wedded to their opinions. Educated in a certain way, and having followed that way in educating, the idea that there can be any way better, or indeed any other way at all, is scouted. This, no doubt, is true of many of us. It is

one of the effects of our employment, to increase our reliance upon our own judgments, to make us "monarchs of all we survey," and therefore impatient of all restraints, and thoroughly determined to regard all interference as impertinent, and to be firmly resisted. Now there are fossils ecclesiastical, and political fossils in the world; but they can be overmatched by educational fossils. When the "*exposition universelle*" of fossils comes off, the educational department will doubtless have the honor of exhibiting the most thorough petrifications. Run a young man through our educational machines, then set him at work grinding at those machines, satisfied that they are the perfection of human achievement, and that he has got just the hang of turning them; and you have the counterpart of the man who, after serving out his sentence in the treadmill, was so enamoured with the employment, that he afterwards ran one for his own amusement.

Now it is one of the advantages of this Institute that, wider in its scope than our State and county associations, it brings together, not only teachers, but all interested in the great cause of human improvement. Educational programmes and methods are subjected to searching criticism, and false notions of superiority get dissipated; and, if not convinced that there is a better way, many minds are opened far enough to receive the idea that there are other ways, and possibly better ones.

There is nothing so cramps the mind as making human knowledge our stock in trade; picking up ideas from this one and that one, getting a smattering of knowledge upon this branch of science and that, for the mere purpose of teaching; making ourselves seem wise in the eyes of our scholars, thereby increasing our own sense of importance, and gaining exalted notions.

He is the best teacher who is the true learner, who reverently worships in God's great temple, and receives into his heart the gracious influences that surround him; who counts himself as never having attained, but always to attain, as he looks out upon the unexplored infinite. He, then, this humble, reverent man, whose blood tingles at every new revelation; who, joyfully receiving, finds still greater joy in giving; who, climbing upwards, attracts by his vigorous life and sweetness of spirit, quickening his pupils, giving them that upward impulse, which shall, by and by, send them even beyond himself, is the true teacher. Welcome, then, all that awakens our enthusiasm, quickens our vision, makes us humble, patient seekers of light!

We are satisfied that the great discussions of the time will issue in the demand for higher qualifications, both in spirit and acquirements, in teachers of all grades; in a higher appreciation of the importance of their calling, on the part of the community; a less strenuous adherence to systems, and a larger confidence in educators themselves. For we must by and by reach the conclusion, that education, even in its best sense, as leading to the highest refinement of soul, the most exquisite enjoyment of the God-given truths of the natural and spiritual worlds, and most certainly in fitting for what may be chosen as the special work of life, must have reference to the conditions, capacities, and wants of the scholars themselves. The system, then, must be large and comprehensive, meeting the needs of all; but its adaptation to the peculiarities of each, must be left to the wise and skilful instructor.

It has happened that many educational reforms have been forced upon educators from without. A blind attachment to system, and a mill-horse daily round, had so narrowed the educational horizon, that there was not room within its

contracted circle for the activities of the world; but the world would be accommodated, and compelled a change of system and administration.

May it be so no longer. Education is for all. In its true meaning, it has to do with man in all his relations to this world, and the world beyond. It has to do with body, mind, and soul. Let educators gain, then, the highest eminences, and get the widest out-look. The world moves. What was good for yesterday is not exactly adapted for to-day. To-morrow will demand something beyond. Be up to the occasion; meet the demand. However imbued and smitten with the culture of the ancients, fail not to comprehend the wants of the present. However caught up and whirled on by the activities of the present, fail not to remember that the present is rooted in the past; that these roots cannot be severed without injury to the flowering and fruitage of the great branches of that tree of knowledge now bending over us.

Pardon me for keeping you so long from the business assigned for this afternoon. The programme is before you. What is your pleasure?

Appointments were made as follows:

COMMITTEE ON NOMINATIONS.—~~Messrs.~~ T. W. Valentine, of New York; H. A. Harrington, of New Bedford; James S. Barrells, of Malne; D. W. Jones, of Boston; S. S. Greene, of Rhode Island; Charles Hammond, of Monson; L. Scott, of Pittsfield; E. Smith, of Dorchester; and B. G. Northrup, of Connecticut.

COMMITTEE ON TEACHERS AND TEACHERS' PLACES.—Messrs. Rugg, of New Bedford; Eaton, of Charlestown; and Stickney, of Newton.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY.—D. W. Jones, of Boston.

DISCUSSION.

The first topic taken up for discussion was, "*Defects in our Present System of Education.*"

Hon. Henry Barnard, Commissioner of Education, was invited to open the discussion, and in doing so, spoke substantially as follows:—

Mr. President, and Ladies and Gentlemen,—In signifying my willingness to respond to an invitation to speak on this occasion, I was not aware of the form of the question. It is, "*Defects in our Present System of Education.*" I am not quite clear, in my own mind, what is meant by "our system of education." Does it mean the organized systems of education, so as to make one whole? or does it refer to the internal economy of the schools?

Not knowing precisely the intention of the Committee, in presenting the subject, I feel a little at a loss in what way to begin my remarks.

In the discharge of the duties of the office I hold, it has been one part of my work to endeavor to ascertain what are the systems of education in the country, the systems in the different States, which go to make up what may be called an American System, and what are the institutions by which the educational wants of forty millions of people are being provided for.

Where are the schools in the different States which are taking our children, as they come up to a proper school age, and starting them on in their career of improvement? Where are our Secondary Schools that occupy a position corresponding to the German Gymnasias, or the Lyceums of France, by which the foundations are laid deeper and stronger, and the edifice is carried higher, so that an effective preparation is made for the superior education which

should follow? Where is our system of superior education? Where,—I will not say our colleges, but,—where is there a single state or city that arranges a course of instruction on such a broad and comprehensive plan as to make it possible to give that education which is understood by a liberal culture in Europe?

I can only say that I have not discovered any such system in all the survey I have made, so that I may be able to present it to-day. The results, I confess, are not satisfactory to my mind. The grand sum total of all our education in this country, at this time, has left more than four millions of our people in a condition that they are unable to read and write. In nearly half the States of this Union there is nothing that can be spoken of as a system of education. In those States where the greatest advances have been made, there is not such a system that the instruments and agencies of instruction can be said to have reached every child in the community.

When we take the most interesting, and in some respects the most successful portion of our people,—our cities,—where we have something like an efficient organization, which takes a child at the age of five or six years, and carries it up through the entire higher course of instruction, including the colleges,—taking even the cities of the country, where there is the nearest approach to a system for all,—more than one third of the children are not, at any one time, to be found in the schools. I do not know how other people regard these facts; but to me they are most significant with reference to the future of our country.

Do not understand me to say that one third of the children are habitually absent; but I say that at any one time or period in the year, they are not present; and, of course, if their attendance is intermittent, now for a week, and now for

a month, with long intervening absence, we know what must inevitably be the result.

I have in my hand some statistics, which, since this subject was proposed, it was my intention to present. It was made a part of my duty officially, to make a report of the condition of education in the District of Columbia. If a foreigner should come to this country, where would he naturally look for the best exhibition of our system of education? Would he not look first to this District, which is directly under the legislation of the general government of the country? There is no other legislation to be exercised there except that of the national government; and yet that is not the place where we would look for an exhibition of our best system of public instruction.

It has been made my duty, by Congress, to make a thorough inquiry into the condition of education in that District, and to bring together the statistics. With a view of enabling Congress to act, in this matter, in an intelligent and enlightened manner, I have endeavored to bring together the statistics of some seventy cities of the country. And I propose to have these so prepared as to show how our capital compares with the great capitals of the governments on the continent of Europe; how Washington compares with Berlin, or Paris, etc.

I will not now undertake to speak of the result; but if you refer to the city of Washington as an example of what our American system of education is, you will find, in the first place, that, as compared with other cities, while it is in advance of some, it is far behind many others. We have some cities that cannot be said to have a good system of education of any kind, beyond that which certain families or teachers or associations have got up, and without any special regard to the education of the whole community. As

compared with Boston, Washington does not educate one half of its children. More than one half of the children of proper school age, are not in any school, at any one time, public or private. Though the primary and intermediate schools of Washington will compare favorably with those of other cities, yet the great fact stands, that out of all the public schools in Washington there are less than two hundred pupils who have passed beyond the common branches of our elementary education; namely, in Algebra, 40; Astronomy, 19; Botany, 18; Book-keeping, 36; Natural Philosophy, 53; Rhetoric, 20; total, 186. In the Constitution of the United States, only 264.

If you pass up into the higher studies, such as are pursued in the high schools of other cities, you must look for them in the private schools. But for the character of these private schools, there is no general supervision and no examination of the teachers who set up the schools; so that there is no guarantee for the parents that these schools will be kept up to a proper standard. You will find there three or four institutions claiming to be colleges, yet not acting with reference to any system or with any reference to the schools below, and none of them looking to any higher degree of education.

As to the defects, then, I should say that we have no system in any State; and we cannot be said to have, outside of a few of the larger cities of the country, anything like a system, where the parts have a relation to each other, and all go to constitute one whole.

If you look at it in its details, you will find that even the best system does not reach the children, to compel regularity of attendance.

It is now scarcely a point to be questioned in any community, that the State has a right to establish public schools,

and that the public property of the country may be taxed for their support. And yet, when you take the position, that the State may compel the attendance of the children upon these schools, you are met with the objection, that you are interfering with the rights of parents to send or not to send their children to school.

In many of the countries of Europe, every child from the age of six to fourteen is supposed to be in the public school; and in many of the cantons of Switzerland, if a child is absent during any part of this course, he is obliged to continue in school beyond the age of fourteen until the absences are made up. If absent enough to make a year, he must continue in school until fifteen years of age.

We ought to be able to say, if we may take property to establish public schools, it is the business of parents to send their children regularly to the school; and it should be required that, if any one will not thus send his child to school, in order to fit him for the discharge of his duties when he shall become a citizen, the parent himself shall not be permitted to exercise the privileges of a citizen. Our public officers for the administration of our Municipal and State affairs, are selected with scarcely the slightest reference to their education. Not a few of those who are intrusted with the highest positions in the country, have nothing of that education which fits them for the particular work which they are to do. Making education compulsory is not always to make it universal. Elementary education is almost universal, and yet there is no absolute, compulsory system of education. But social life, in all its gradations, is determined by education, in Europe. Society is determined by the results of a series of examinations, and they are educational. And every parent knows that when his son starts on his career in life, he cannot rise unless he is edu-

cated. And they make it so much for the interest of parents and of the community, that they establish schools, and require that the children shall attend them.

The next defect is in regard to the administration of the schools, such as they are. Twenty-five years ago, some of us met in this town in connection with this Institute, to consider the subject of education. Since that time immense results have been attained. At that time, only three or four States had public school superintendents, and but a few of the cities had local superintendents. In the matter of administration we have undoubtedly made great advances since that period. We have secured the services of competent men as superintendents, who receive liberal salaries. I have in my hand a document giving the salaries paid to superintendents and teachers in forty-two cities. We have one city whose superintendent receives a salary of \$1000, while the average salary of thirty-one, is \$2360. The whole number of male teachers in these cities is nine hundred and one, six of whom receive a salary of \$4,000; fifty receive \$3000, or over; two hundred and six receive \$2,000 or over; and the average salary of each is \$1,702.55. The whole number of female teachers is eight thousand two hundred and twenty, one of whom only receives a salary of \$2000; while four receive \$1700; seventeen receive \$1600; sixty, \$1500; and the average salary of each is \$542.45. The whole number of teachers, male and female, is nine thousand one hundred and twenty-one, whose aggregate salaries amount to \$5,993,000; and whose average salaries were \$657.08. Twenty-five years ago, I think there were but five teachers in New England, out of Boston, who received a salary of \$1,500.

While we have these defects that have been mentioned, it will be seen that there are some things which are exceed-

ingly encouraging. These are, the liberality with which schools are supported. But generally, although schools have not a proper system of supervision as yet, there are great advances made in this direction.

Passing from the subject of defects in reference to attendance and administration, there is a great defect in relation to teachers. After all the discussions we have had in State and National Associations, it seems to me that the public mind should be ripe enough to recognize teaching as a profession; that, as a body, the advice of teachers should be sought and given in all matters that relate to schools. In every school system in Europe, there is a recognition of the teachers, as a body; and if there is to be any legislation had, they are consulted. In all the great changes which have taken place in the Prussian System, the teachers have been consulted. Although we speak of that as a monarchical and arbitrary government, the Minister of Education always takes the advice of prominent teachers before he puts forth his instructions. So, in the various cantons of Switzerland, the Synod of Teachers has the nomination and the appointment of a portion of the Board of Education. They have a direct influence in this as a national body. It seems to me a great defect, that that body of men who are most interested in having the work of education done well, is not consulted so far as to be respected as a body, and as individuals, in their respective school rooms. (Applause.)

While it is desirable that teachers should be respected as a body, and their influence regarded, it is due to themselves that they put a check on the admission of unworthy members. They should hold up a standard; the certificate by which a teacher enters a school should be given by the teachers as a body, and they should specify the qualifications necessary; and until such a certificate is given, no teacher should be per-

mitted to go into a public or private school. Upon that subject it seems to me that teachers, both public and private, should arouse themselves to protect their own profession. It seems to me that the public should demand some better guarantee as to the character of the school which their children are to attend, than they now have, in a great many instances.

It is one peculiarity of the French, and generally of the schools in the Continental States, that private education is to some extent a matter of supervision. They say that the teacher shall give evidence, before he sets up a school, that somewhere or other he has attained the knowledge requisite to teach, and has shown that he knows how to govern before he shall be intrusted with the management of scholars.

There are many very great excellencies in our system ; and because I have dwelt upon the defects, I hope the Institute will not believe that I am not aware of the excellencies. But still, I do not believe the country is generally aware of these defects. I am quite certain that members of Congress are not aware how deficient we are in some of these respects.

I hope that we shall not, in the meetings of this Institute, confine ourselves to the discussion of the subjects of elementary education, as we are, I think, too generally confined ; but that we shall take up those problems which relate to secondary education ; that we shall endeavor to know what our academies and high schools are doing, and our private and boarding schools, which, to some extent, come in to complete the education begun in the elementary schools. If our colleges are to compare with the universities of Europe, we must make some radical changes. Our colleges now occupy almost the place of secondary schools abroad. We have scarcely a college in this country which can fit students to enter a gymnasium in Germany. We talk about giving an

optional course of instruction in our colleges; but we forget that our college graduates, with the exception of getting a little more natural science, are precisely where the gymnasium scholars are, and that the real university has already gone beyond our college course. So that, if we would make our colleges what they ought to be, we must begin by making our academies what they ought to be. What do we know about them? When we know that the teachers are men of such moral and intellectual qualifications as those of Mr. Hammond, of Monson, we are prepared to estimate the character of the teaching. But there is nothing to settle a course of study for a preparation to enter college. We are just beginning to have meetings of college professors. It seems to me that they should meet with us, that we may endeavor to get light, and come to some agreement as to what shall constitute a system of American education. (Applause).

Prof. W. P. Atkinson, of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Boston, said, I am not sure, Mr. President, that the topic you have assigned me will not excite surprise in the minds of some people, — “The *Defects* of our School System.” Has it then defects? To hear the praise that is usually lavished on it, one would be inclined to believe that it is already the perfection of human reason, the one institution in which we beat the world. I suppose you called upon me to speak on it, as being what people are pleased to call a “radical.” You did right, sir; but I will begin with disappointing you. I will begin with praising our school system. As a system, we ought to be proud of it; for the world cannot show the like, nor can any national system as yet show equal results in the general good conduct, intelligence, and power of self-government of a whole people. These results do flow, more than from any other source, from those free

schools, open alike to high and low, rich and poor, good and bad, black and white, and where all meet together to acquire that knowledge, without which self-government is an impossibility. And we may be rightly proud, sir, of the firm hold the system has taken on the heart of the people, of the interest they have taken in it, the sacrifices they are willing to make in order to sustain and improve it. If I am a radical, and a critic of it, it is because of the interest I take in its improvement; because of the deep conviction I feel, that free schools are so completely one main pillar of our national welfare, so absolutely essential to our national success, that we can never at any moment rest on our oars, and say, "They are well enough; let us let well alone." However good they may be, we should never be satisfied, unless we are continually making them better; unless they are continually expanding and improving, to meet the new wants of new times, and of a nation which is growing with a vigor and rapidity the world never saw before. If I undertake the part you have assigned me, sir, it is that of a friendly not a hostile critic; and we have no better friends than those who are willing to convict us of our faults, and point out to us our short-comings.

If, then, Mr. President, we neglect for a moment the chorus of praise which rises on every hand, and look a little under the surface, we shall find many evidences, I think, that our schools are far from perfect, that that laudation has come, from constant repetition, to be a sort of commonplace, repeated without reflection, and not always sustained by liberal and enlightened action. If it were — if we believed *all* we profess — should we find, even in New England, so many poor and dilapidated school-houses; so many cheap teachers, who yet are perhaps worth no more than what they are paid; so much unintelligent acquiescence in old routine? Should

we, above all, find children taken away from school at such an early age, if the education they are getting were so good as it might be, and commended itself to parents as strongly as it might, as the very best investment they could make of their children's time?

I am prepared to say that, good as is the beginning we have made, noble as is the *plan*, our system of popular education is not, at this moment, adequate to meet the wants of the times; that, as an institution, it is behind, not in advance of the times. The consequence is, that, after our boys have used it so far as to learn to read, their *real* education is handed over to the newspapers; and among them, the Brick Pomeroy's and the N. Y. Herald's are not the least influential schoolmasters. After our girls have learned to read, their *real* education drifts quite too much out of the hands of their teachers, and into the hands of sensation novel-writers.

I wish to speak with all respect of the various educational organizations which hold their meetings in different parts of the country at this time; but what is the influence of the whole of them, compared with that of one bad and able newspaper? Our colleges are just now holding their annual festivities. Are we not conscious that, in reckoning up the vital influences that at this moment control society and form public sentiment, these colleges are of far less account than they ought to be, or than they used to be?

I think the explanation is not far to seek. It is not that there is less love of knowledge: on the contrary there is more. But the progress of society has outrun the organization of the school. New times demand a new adaptation of instrumentalities. I suppose that, when the Reformation struck a death-blow at the power of the Romish church, many honest and sincere Catholics believed it was the end of all religion. But true religion only grew stronger by the

change. The religious sentiment, which can never die out of men's hearts, only took higher and truer forms. And to-day, many of us "radicals" are looking to see a similar regeneration in Protestant forms, to adapt them more truly to the religious wants of the day and hour. So it is with all institutions, material and spiritual. The outward form decays; the life passes on into higher and larger forms.

If I am a radical in education, — and I am not at all afraid of the name, for I think the *true* radical is also as true a conservative, — it is in this sense: that I want to see the education of our schools more accurately adjusted to the real wants of our people. Our fathers, as I have said, took the greatest step that ever was taken in popular education when they organized free schools as part and parcel of the State, — free (theoretically) from the control of sectarian churches, and open to the whole people. But they were not in a position to do more than make the frame-work of their great institution. How its details should be organized, what the ingredients were which should go to make up the popular education of a great and free people, — those were problems which never had been solved, and which the times were not ripe for solving. Our fathers did the only thing possible under the circumstances: they laid out their magnificent *plan* of free education for the whole people, and then they were forced to borrow and import into it the details and methods of the mother country; and the circumstances of New England in particular gave a narrowness and a peculiar bias even to those.

Now, nothing, to my mind, is more certain than that the educational institutions of every country must be of home growth. In some respects, the education of Prussia is in advance of that of any nation; but Prussian educational institutions, introduced into America, would prove a total failure.

We can borrow from Prussia those principles of teaching which depend upon the constitution of human nature, all that is common to the nature of all human minds; but the details of practical education, to be of any practical value, must be carefully modified to suit national character and national circumstances — must be strictly the *growth* of these.

I make bold to say that, in that sense, we have not as yet any national system of education. We have built the frame of our educational house — have covered it in, I hope, safe from all storms; but its partitions and internal arrangements have yet all to be constructed, and the internal arrangements of no foreign house will suit the style of our edifice.

We borrowed our systems and methods — so far as we can be said to have any system, which is not far — from England chiefly. Now England is a country of castes and classes. Nothing is more striking, in reading, as I have lately done, the recently published “Elaborate British Parliamentary Report” on “middle class” education, than the constant reference to classes, — the effete and decaying relic of Feudalism, the hereditary aristocracy; the middle class, which again is *upper* middle class, *middle* middle class, and *lower* middle class, and beneath all the *lower* classes. Now, thank Heaven, we have no hereditary aristocracy to get rid of, nor have we anything corresponding to the dense and brutal ignorance of the English “lower class.” It is plain that all notions of education, so far as they are class notions, are wholly unsuited to us; yet, if we analyze carefully, we find that a great many of the accepted notions and methods which we follow without questioning in our schools, as if they were laws of nature herself, are borrowed from this class system of England.

Let me give a concrete example. The practical result of

the present time-honored entrance-examination to our colleges, is that the young men preparing for it are crammed with an inordinate amount of knowledge of the two languages of classical antiquity, — or, rather, it would be safe to say, that the attempt is made to cram them ; — while they are allowed to reach the age of eighteen, in blank and total ignorance of natural and physical science, in equal ignorance of moral and social science, as taught by history, and with their taste for art wholly uncultivated and unawakened. Not a particle of knowledge of these things is required for admission ; and, as a rule, we know that what is required for examination at college, is what will be studied in school. This system is defended as the perfection of educational philosophy ! And it is safe to say, that there is not a primary-school in the land that does not feel its baneful effects. For the influence of a false system of higher education is by no means confined to its immediate recipients. It indirectly affects and perverts our ideal throughout ; words are exalted by it above realities, till the Irish infant is taught nothing but words in the primary school, till the grammar-school boy is crammed with empty words, till the true education of the majority in the high school is sacrificed to the demands of the little minority of one sex who are going to college.

I give this merely as an example. I do not propose to go into the well-trodden ground of the classical question any further. You know, sir, that I am no bigoted enemy of the classics, in their proper place and time ; but such a phenomenon as this, I say, can only be explained by our unreasoning acquiescence in historical tradition, our borrowing of the class-system of England for a purpose which it cannot serve. I am happy to think that the evil is in the course of being remedied, for I am sure that our school system can never be what it ought to be till our higher institutions of learning

are prepared to infuse *healthy* life-blood into all the lower schools. This they do not do now.

Mr. President, a great deal is being said about a *liberal* education,—what does and what does not constitute it,—and we are solemnly warned to defend it against the utilitarian spirit of the age; as if to be liberal and to be useful were two distinct and contradictory things. Shall I tell you what I think is a true liberal education? I believe that the divine Providence, in placing us here, meant that our *lives* should be our liberal education, and no education seems to me good for anything except just in proportion as it enables us to *live* higher and *act* better in the sphere and in the time in which we find ourselves placed. I believe that, in accordance with this view, there is an ideal yet to be realized of a *liberal popular* education, though to many minds the phrase embodies a contradiction in terms,—a liberal popular, as distinct from a liberal class, education, one which will not consist of the crumbs that fall from the aristocratic or the ecclesiastical or the professional tables; and, whenever we shall have realized in practice a true philosophy of education,—I do not look to see it in my day,—the foundation of that liberal education will be laid, not in colleges or Latin-schools, but in the lowest primary school. Hitherto we have been attempting to adjust our educational machinery in accordance with the theory that there are *two* radically different kinds of education,—a “liberal” aristocratic and a popular “utilitarian” education. It is easy to see where the theory came from; it is equally easy to see that it is a theory which cannot prevail in a really republican country. Hitherto we have not had a republic; but now that the last vestiges of class distinction are disappearing, in the happily accomplished abolition of slavery, and that equally important reform, the emancipation of woman, which we see so rapidly

advancing, we have got to discover some system of mental development which will apply equally to all. When our very President may any day come from the slums of New York City, — I cannot go any lower than that, — we have got to devise a liberal education for the slums of New York City. Surely this cannot be called a chimerical or impractical doctrine, when we have so lately had such dire evidence of the mischiefs and the national disgrace which may come from an occupant of the presidential chair, who has wriggled up to it without any such training.

It is much easier to say what this liberal popular education is not, than to determine what it is. Plainly, it does not consist in Latin and Greek, though one result of it would be some *real* classical scholars, — a greater result than can be claimed for our present system. It is not the education of an English duke, or an English parson of the Established Church, or of an English tradesman who has got rich, and sends his boys to Eton and Oxford, with the shabby desire of aping what are called his superiors. We have no dukes and no established church, and it is not desirable to encourage the growth of subjects for an American Thackeray's Book of Snobs. And yet I fear it is no higher motive that sometimes leads a man to pervert his son's education during all the best years of school-life, only that he may idle away four of the best years of young manhood at an American college. At any rate, this is too often the sad result. I do not see much light upon the problem coming from abroad. I do not think, for instance, that Mr. Matthew Arnold's very charming but yet slightly priggish ideal of "sweetness and light," is quite adequate to our wants and occasions. A little more *strength* is needed, — strength which is not necessarily coarseness. Nor do I think we shall get it through the French system of bureaucratic centralization, which he admires so much; nor

yet from Prussian drill-sergeants, or German "Regulativen." We have got to work out the problem for ourselves, and in our own way. Perhaps, as a part of her system of self-government, America is destined to give the world what the world does not possess now, — a true philosophy of education; indeed, if America does not do it, she will not be self-governed long.

After what I have said, you will not expect me to do it here to-day; and yet it is the only way to answer the question, What are the defects of our present system? Speaking generally, it is easy to say that a liberal, that is a true, education, consists in symmetrical mental development; and symmetrical mental development is as easy to realize, and no easier, in an Irish primary school, as far as it goes, as in a college; and, until it is realized in the primary school, it never will be in the college. Guided by this thought, it would be easy, if time allowed, to point out some, at least, of the defects of the unphilosophic jumble which we call our school course of study. I said we had raised and covered in our educational edifice, and now the task was to partition it off. Rather we *have* partitioned it off in all sorts of awkward and inconvenient ways. We have made long passages in it which lead nowhere, chambers without windows, rooms in which the children can't stand upright; and we have furnished them with patent stocks and racks, and other instruments of mental torture, in the shape of bad school-books; so that the poor children come out, not mentally developed, but mentally crippled and maimed, till sensible people begin to grow shy of our educational structure, and, after allowing their children to remain a little while — not long enough to hurt them — in the basement story, send them off to work, preferring the fresh air of nature and the discipline of life to our cramped and artificial ways. And I fear they are right.

If any one thinks this extravagant, let him go into some famous high-pressure school, and hear a class recite in what is called history, from some dry-bones of a compendium. Hear them set up and knock down dynasties, make treaties and declare bloody wars, and rattle the greatest names of kings, statesmen, and heroes about your ears, and then let him put a few well-directed questions, to test the adequacy of their ideas on these great subjects. Or let him enter the room in which the parsing mill is kept; and hear "Paradise Lost"—read? Not at all. Understood? Far from it. But *parsed*, and the opinions of Brown, Jones, and Robinson, those great manufacturers of school grammars, discussed, as to the true nature of pronominal adjectives, and other abstruse and important matters. Yet such schools are generally reckoned admirable. I have been in a school of no mean reputation, where little boys of ten were engaged in repeating, by rote, page after page of Andrews and Stoddard's Latin Grammar, exactly as it stood. I say it is a frightful school. I value education; but I would rather my boys should run in the fields and learn nature's lessons from the birds and the brooks, than go to such a school. It is not mental discipline; it is mental distortion. And the birds and the brooks are things which, under this system, our children don't study at all. Why is it that Brown's or Robinson's opinion (generally wrong), about the nature of a pronominal adjective, has come to be considered a quite vital and necessary part of all elementary education, while—for all our schools teach—our children do not learn to distinguish a crow from a screech-owl, or to tell what makes the water in the brook run over its dam. If you will examine, I think you will find the true answer to be unreasoning prejudice in favor of old tradition.

If time allowed, I should like to go through the whole course of study in our public schools, and try to point out to what

an extent either the wrong things are taught, or, what is just as bad, the right things at the wrong time, or in a wrong way. Take a docile boy, or what is more common, a docile girl, who has been subjected to the full rigor of our public school system, from the lowest stage to the highest, and has graduated from a High School at last with all the prizes and all the diplomas and all the medals. I saw such a one the other day, and she was asking herself what she had been made to do it for. She was a sensible girl, and she knew she was not educated, but only crammed. She was pale and weary. She had given health for knowledge, and the knowledge was not sound and wholesome. What will she ever do with a smattering of trigonometry, and a little French, and a bit of magnetism and electricity and a fragment of what passes for mental philosophy, all painfully toiled through, but never digested, never made a part of her real self. I fear she would have done better to stay at home and milk the cows. I knew a family of sisters once, who all grew up and were married. One of them was a scholar, and she is in her grave, and school killed her. The rest are happy, unintellectual wives and mothers. School teaching ran off from them as water runs off a duck's back, and that is really all that saves most of our children. Nature never ceases to produce in the greatest abundance, good, dull, healthy, naughty boys and girls, whom you can lead to the duly appointed educational trough, but who cannot, by any compulsion, be made to drink therein. I applaud nature, and hope she will never cease producing in that direction.

I have earned my right to criticise, sir, for I have done my full share of bad teaching. I don't know that we are any of us to blame for it. Suppose you took young people of eighteen or nineteen, fresh from high schools and colleges, and put them in command of ocean steamships, and said: "There, my young friends, it is true you don't know much about navigation and

you know still less about the properties of steam, so it is quite possible you may run on a rock, or blow yourselves up. Nevertheless, you have got to *try* to navigate by the light of nature." What wonder if they should run aground! And yet that is pretty much the way our educational craft is navigated.

The result is, that when we get beyond the merest rudiments, a great deal of our popular education is unwholesome and unsound. It is pretentious and superficial. It attempts so much that it does nothing thoroughly. It is mere book-knowledge, mere rote-work. It injures the minds of the recipients, and it does not abide the test of actual life. The work does not stand. It is mere varnishing and veneering. The teachers themselves have never digested the mass of matter they are required to teach. It is not their fault: they would gladly have done it; but they were crammed themselves, and so the superficiality of their own education goes on perpetuating itself on that of their pupils. Who does not look back to his own school training as the source of all his mental defects? Who that was faithful in trying to perform the tasks that were set him, does not think, with mortification, how much better off he would have been if he had only let them alone; does not think with sadness on time wasted, and health injured, in mind-destroying drudgery; does not see around him many who have prospered better, because in them nature was stronger to rebel?

If there is any truth in these strictures, — and that there is some, I think, almost everyone will allow, — it seems to me that a remedy may be looked for in two directions.

In the first place, if we undertake to do too much, and consequently do it badly, suppose we attempt less and do it well? I think, for instance, that a very nice primary school might be made, such a school as I, for one, would gladly

send a little girl of mine to. I carefully keep her from all primary schools now. I say a very nice primary school might be made by taking one of the intelligent young ladies I see before me, — giving her a pleasant sunny room, a little museum of such objects as interest the childish mind, a small collection of nice books and pictures, giving her a suitable number of children, and telling her to go and *have a good time* with them, — first and foremost to have a good time. If she failed to teach them abracadabra, she should be pardoned. No grim committee-man should make her afraid lest she should not have the required number of pages ready at the right moment, and all the sums and all the Roman numerals, and other parts of useless knowledge; but she should *not* be pardoned if she and the children did not have a good time. Not that she should be forbidden to punish them, even “corporally,” if dire necessity required; for you know, Mr. President, I have an old-fashioned faith that we don’t live in a world to be governed wholly by sugar-plums. Still, I think that, with a moderately clever teacher, left thus to her own devices, allowed thus to teach those little souls in natural and simple instead of cramped and unnatural ways, the rod would go into voluntary banishment, and those little folks, instead of knowing less of abracadabra than they do now, would become little miracles of education.

That, however, would not be the main object. Those children would have to love and not to hate knowledge; their tastes might be formed and elevated, and a craving for real knowledge excited, which it would take the remainder of their lives to satisfy. Do our children come out of school now with such a love and such a craving? One has only to pay a few visits to an ordinary grammar-school, or to that forlornest of spectacles, an ordinary primary school, and he will be at no loss for an answer.

It may be said that my ideas are very pretty, but very utopian. I believe that until we cease thinking such ideas utopian, and get rid of some of the dead clattering machinery of our schools, and give freer play to spontaneous impulse, and trust more to nature and less to rules and pedants, we shall have no real life in our teaching.

I should be very well contented if children graduated from our lower schools, knowing how to read, and *loving* to read, equipped with a small stock of such knowledge as will be most useful and valuable to them in the life they are to lead, and with their eyes open to the fact of how much more there is in this world of wonders to know, and how interesting it is to know it. They come out now, having committed abracadabra to memory, and straightway forget it, and in their after life are almost as if they had never seen the inside of a school-room. I don't care how much they may have committed to memory; that isn't education.

If we are not to do much in our schools, we need not take so much time about it. It is a curious result of that remarkable experiment of Mr. Chadwick's, with the factory children in England, that the half-time factory children learn as much as the full-time school children, and learn it to better purpose. What a satire is that on our wearisome confinement of children, our wearisome lesson-learning. And what a stultifying lesson it is to make children drawl an hour over work which they might, if they had felt any interest in it, have done in half an hour. I have tried, Mr. President, to repent of all the novels I read in school; but I never could succeed. "Leather-stocking" and "Ivanhoe," I believe, taught me more than the Latin grammar, though I distinctly remember being made to recite from memory the whole of the rules of syntax, in old Adam, without stopping. I said *recite*: I did not say understand.

But I think the times demand that we should do not a little but a good deal in our schools ; and it behooves us to learn how to do it. It seems to me that the first necessity is a revision of our course of school study. Supposing the whole of school time, or any stage of it, to be represented by a line of twelve inches : we may imagine that divided into four equal divisors of three inches, or three equal ones of four, or into unequal ones in innumerable ways. Now we can roughly classify the innumerable objects of thought and study in this world of ours, and no one will deny that a true philosophy of education would subdivide school time and attention between the right subjects and in exactly the right proportions. Can we say that we have yet reached any such philosophy or even begun to realize it in the actual arrangements of our schools ? I will not deny the difficulty of the problem. I know that such a subdivision must be made in accordance with a true psychology which we cannot be said, as yet, to have reached. But in many of our doings do we not violate fundamental principles which all begin to recognize ? What, for instance, shall be said about the enormous space heretofore occupied by the study of grammar and the utter neglect of natural history ? Does psychology teach that we should begin with dosing the youthful mind with the driest of metaphysical abstractions while we postpone the cultivation of the observing powers to about the age of fourteen, if we cultivate them at all ? What shall we say about the wisdom of allowing the study of arithmetic to push out of our grammar-schools all geometry, all natural philosophy, and all drawing ? Is it in accordance with a true philosophy of the human mind to devote the child's whole attention to the abstractions of number, while his ideas of forms are wholly neglected and no pains is taken to teach him anything about the laws that govern those great physical forces in the midst of which his

whole life's work will be? What prodigies of arithmetical knowledge our children ought to be! Are they? The reason why, on the contrary, they know arithmetic so ill, is that they study it too much. I knew of some grammar-schools, once, where the arithmetic of our wretched school-books was curtailed, say a third or a half, and plain geometry and a little drawing introduced, and the result was that the boys and girls learned arithmetic *better*. One of the Rugby masters has recently told us that the result of introducing the study of physical science into that school was that the boys learned their Latin and Greek better. "Do you know, Sam., why you are doing your arithmetic so much better?" said a master of my acquaintance to an arithmetical blockhead. No: he did not know. "It is because Miss Smith has interested you so in botany." The boy's mind had been waked up.

I should like to know if any one thinks nowadays that all our children are born to spend their childhood in the study of nouns and participles on the one hand, and multiplication and the greatest common divisor on the other; varied, to be sure, with lists of the highest peaks of the Himalayas and the longest rivers of South America. It is well for us that the children are so feeble in body, or we should have a rebellion worse than the slaveholders' — a rebellion *against* a mental slavery.

My notion of good primary and grammar school teaching is that it should begin in reality with the whole circle of knowledge, and should aim at developing the youthful mind, by carrying a great many subjects, by simple empirical methods, a very little way. The mind to be developed, should be the centre of all teaching, not as now a pedantic regard for all the subdivisions of the studies taught. Nothing is more absurd than this outcry for greater simplicity of teaching; that, for the sake of thoroughness, we must confine children

to what are absurdly called rudimentary studies. To confine the early education of children to reading, writing, and arithmetic, is, as some one has said, to give them a knife and fork and plate, but no dinner. You might as well call the Kantian philosophy rudimentary as the abstractions of grammar and numbers properly studied. These are instruments of knowledge; their mastery should be begun and *only* begun. Meantime the childish mind, a new comer into this glorious world spread out before it, is filled with an inextinguishable curiosity to know its secrets, has a fancy and an imagination and a love of beauty ready to be developed. Shall we baffle its curiosity and deaden its love of beauty and shut it up in darkness by our pretended education.

Good primary, good grammar school teaching, then, instead of being emptied of all substance, as it is so apt to be now, leaving nothing but the barren form of knowledge,—dry rules of grammar, abstractions of arithmetic, the mechanism of writing, parallels of latitude and meridians of longitude,—should be filled full of reality. Primary and grammar school teachers should teach all the sciences, only without their children knowing it; begin to lay even at the earliest age the empirical foundation, in habits of observation and reasoning on which afterwards higher scientific knowledge may be built, the science of the outer world of matter, and, in its proper place and time, the science of the inner world of mind. Children begin to be observers as soon as they have eyes. Why should not their powers of observation be trained from the very beginning? They begin to be destroyers at least as soon as they have hands. Why should not their natural activity be turned at once from destroying to creating? What intense delight it gives a child to succeed in *making* anything, even the rudest picture. Children begin to have imaginations as soon as they begin to think. Why should we not feed their imaginations

with story, picture, and poem? I reckon those novels, sir, surreptitiously read,—"Leather Stocking," "Ivanhoe," and the rest,—a very important, though an outlawed and unrecognized, part of my school education. And of what we dignify by learned names, and call mental and moral science, law, politics and jurisprudence, how many seeds of thought, planted to germinate hereafter, can a sensible teacher sow, who is *not* a pedant, and who will consent to study the mental condition of his pupils. Of course, of the words philosophy and jurisprudence the boy or girl should hear no more than they should hear of the words dynamics or ichthyology, though it is of the words, and nothing else, that they are apt to hear now. To examine the little fish the child catches on his pin-hook, is childish ichthyology, as truly so as the researches of Agassiz himself. Who knows whether it was not in that way that he began, whether some primary school teacher did not implant in him that love for observing the world of nature which has produced so much.

And if these studies are not begun at the beginning, with the vast majority of pupils they are never begun at all. The mass of children, condemned to the deadening routine of abstractions, come out spoiled, their curiosity baffled, their mental activity gone. Beyond learning to read, the rest of school-life has been an injury instead of a benefit. It would have been better if they had been learning a trade. And reading itself is as likely to prove a curse instead of a blessing, where no love of *good* reading has been fostered or implanted.

If, then, the mass of knowledge were spread before us, and we should attempt to redistribute the work of the different grades of schools, I think it should be done on a totally different system from that which is in vogue now. At present, the mere tools and implements of learning are thrust into the lower schools, and the attempt is made to give the poor little

children, in their most immature stage, a complete mastery of these, before they are allowed the least view of real knowledge. What a pitiful sight it is to see the attempt to teach children to *spell* the whole English language! You and I, sir, have no right to be able to spell the whole English language till we have mastered the *meaning* of all its words. Children *ought* to be imperfect spellers. It is hollow, empty show, learning to consume their time in spelling words they don't understand, and will never have occasion to use. Let them learn to spell words as fast as they master the ideas they stand for; that will be fast and far enough. What an absurdity to try to teach children to parse "*Paradise Lost*," as a way of making them understand it — teaching them how to walk, by explaining to them the anatomy of their legs! To make a child to write a single sentence will teach him more of language than all the blundering work of our mercenary grammar-makers.

It would be too long to carry out this principle in detail. In education it does not answer as an apology for not beginning a study at the right time to say that you carried another very far at the wrong time. That only makes the matter worse. To plead, as an excuse for not teaching natural history or natural philosophy, when the child's curiosity was awake and alive, that you taught or attempted to teach him more grammar and mathematics than he could understand, is only to say that you did him two injuries, instead of one; not content with neglecting the right subjects, you did him the further injury of prematurely hurrying him too far in the wrong one.

I have spoken of the ignorance of college candidates. Another illustration of the defects of our present system of school instruction ought to be given, from our experience at the Institute of Technology. Young men come to us, from the public schools, at the average age of seventeen, knowing

the amount of mathematics requisite for admission, knowing the situation of a good many places on the surface of the globe, some of the chief dates of American history, and how to parse according to the school grammar that may chance to be in vogue. They know nothing of natural history, nothing to any real purpose of natural philosophy; they have never touched a pencil to draw; if they are set to perform an experiment, their fingers are all thumbs. They can describe it, perhaps, from a text-book, but cannot *see* it when it is before their eyes. In spite of parsing, their written style is that of children, and their real knowledge of or taste for English literature may be accounted *nil*. The consequence is, that, as our course of study, which is necessarily a hard one, and must be pursued with rigorous exactness, does not get its foundation properly laid in the schools, we are kept back at least a year,— I am not sure but two,— by the necessity of doing work, of laying foundations, which ought to have been laid before the age of seventeen. Habits of mind have to be formed, which should have been firmly settled long before; and it is safe to say, that the higher parts of scientific study can never be so successfully pursued by a youth, whose scientific training has been almost wholly postponed to the age of seventeen, as by one whose habits of observation and powers of reasoning upon what he sees, have been trained from his very childhood.

Now, in reverting once more to this fundamental notion of a *liberal popular* education — I am not in the least afraid of the seeming paradox: it ought not to seem a paradox to a republican people, — is it not apparent that we need a broader foundation on which to build it, which popular elementary education *must* furnish, if it is not to fall into still greater discredit? The time is fast coming, in this country, when that intimate association which now exists between the no-

tion of a liberal education and of two or three particular, and so to speak, *protected* professions, is to be dissolved. We are to have not merely liberally educated clergymen, lawyers, and physicians, — the relative and artificial importance of those so-called learned professions is every day growing less, — but liberally educated merchants, farmers, manufacturers, engineers, mechanics, as well; and how plain it is that the purest educational machinery is inadequate and insufficient to meet these new wants! The liberally educated merchant, manufacturer, or farmer of the future, cannot be one who has gained “sweetness and light” by spending his youth in reading the Roman poets (say Catullus or Juvenal); but one who has trained his mind, by rigid and manly discipline, to apply the laws of mechanical or chemical or economical science to his calling and profession in life, and so has made that, too, a *liberal* profession, — one too, who, though he may know little of Athenian institutions, has studied the institutions of his own country to such good purpose, that he can give a reason for the political faith that is in him, and stands quite above the influence of the dirty demagoguism of a Brick Pomeroy, or the swindling sophistries of a General Butler. And though he may not know the Roman poets, he will have gained sweetness and light, cultivation, and refinement of mind, by acquiring a real knowledge of, and a real love for, the literature of his mother tongue; and where, in the world of the present or the past, is there a nobler one? And what will be done completely and thoroughly by our public schools, taken as a whole, will be done just as thoroughly, as far as it goes, in each separate stage of teaching. Even the little primary scholar will get something beyond spelling and the Roman numerals; and the boy and girl who must finish their education with the grammar-school, will have received such a taste and love for

good literature and such an amount of practical knowledge of the scientific principles on which the arts of life depend, as will be invaluable in their callings, and may, perhaps, be the foundation of the highest success. With a higher and truer standard of teaching, I am bold to think this possible ; and on such foundations we shall, at some time, build up American colleges and universities, worthy of the name.

This is a very imperfect discussion of a great subject. I have put my statements strongly, on purpose to elicit discussion.

Rev. Charles Hammond, of Monson. Mr. President,— We need new definitions of the terms used in this discussion. When the gentleman from Cambridge talks about a “liberal” education for Irish boys in “common” schools, he uses words with a sense not found in any dictionary.

The gentleman calls himself a “radical,”—on one occasion he described himself as a “dreadful radical.” Now, I think we had better all agree upon this as a good definition of a “radical,”—as *one who pulls up things by the roots*. He would pull up every existing system or method in education, because they are so defective ; but he plants nothing in the place of what he pulls up.

He doubts whether we have ever had any system really American, because, according to his view of the matter, all our classical schools have been modelled after the patterns of English universities. And, what is specially objectionable, these systems have a taint of English aristocracy about them that is really alarming.

Now, I utterly deny the assumption that our American schools have, in any of their grades, from the lowest to the highest, been copied after English or European models ; or that they have now, or ever had, any savor of English aristocracy.

Any student of American history, who understands the annals of education in this country, knows better than to make such an assertion.

There were no reasons why our ancestors should, but a great many why they should not, adopt the opinions and imitate the systems favored by bishops and lords, in relation to the education of their own children for service in their own commonwealth. They had their own peculiar ideas of education, — as to its ends and means and methods. The idea of free universal education for every child in the state was wholly American, and was fully conceived and adopted in New England more than a hundred years before Horace Mann was born. The idea of free schools in Connecticut was familiar several generations before the distinguished gentleman who opened this discussion began his great life-work in that State.

Our fathers were too wise to try to imitate England, by the endeavor to establish an Oxford or a Cambridge on these shores. The founders of Harvard College were practical men, who knew what they needed, and so they fashioned their schools of every grade to meet their immediate and pressing wants. They hesitated about calling their colleges by that name. Neal, in his "History of New England," speaks of the college at Cambridge as "their academy," — using the word just as Dr. Boyne in his "History of the English Dissenters," and the "Dissenters' Academies," has done. The leading aim of Harvard and Yale, from the first down to the beginning of the present century, was to educate Puritan ministers; and for that reason it was, that, in all matters of education, the influence of such men in England as Isaac Watts and Philip Doddridge, was greater with the leading minds and scholars of this country than all the bishops and dignitaries of the church and universities of England combined.

Boyne

No doubt our American system of education, originating as it did, was defective; and yet it deserves our respect, nevertheless. It was suited to the times, and was fruitful of great results, with all its lack of classic culture, which was caused from their neglect, not from their imitation of English and European systems. Had their great thinkers, such as Jonathan Edwards, of Stockbridge, and Samuel Hopkins, of Great Barrington, who wrote among these Berkshire hills, had more classical culture, their great thoughts would have reached more minds. And yet, with all their defects of style, their works will live, and stand a better chance for fame and admiration than those lights which now glimmer on Boston flats.

Prof. Atkinson. I supposed my friend Hammond would pitch into me. But perhaps he would not, if he had understood me exactly. I did not mean that we copied, in our colleges and schools, Oxford and Cambridge. If I had said European education, I should, perhaps, have better expressed my idea. That was the only idea which existed at the time. The idea of educating the whole people did not exist; but only the idea of education for two or three professions. I know our fathers departed from that idea; but in their colleges, and in carrying out the details, it was impossible that they should not copy, in many respects, the English colleges.

Mr. Hammond responded, asserting that science as well as classical learning had been fostered in Yale College, since the days of President Stiles, who was as much interested in whatsoever of science there was, as in classics; and science and classical learning have been planted together and carried on in harmony, without opposition to anything but science falsely so called.

Mr. Morse, of Hartford, expressed his hearty approval of the paper presented by Prof. Atkinson. If he has "torn up

things by the roots," he had, at least, left the ground free to produce something better than the ill-shaped trees or miserable shrubs, that we see about us. He had been pained many times to find that men are not trained to meet the actual emergencies of life, and especially in regard to an ability to rise and address an assembly in a clear and interesting manner. The reason for this is to be found in the kind of training received, which commences in the primary school. The mind is not early developed; children are not taught to think, and the mind does not grow as the body does. The teachers of our primary and intermediate schools need to understand the great truths stated by Prof. Atkinson.

Mr. Elbridge Smith, of Dorchester, said he understood the gentleman from Cambridge to compliment highly the American northern army. I believe, said he, that army, in the judgment of the country and the world, accomplished a most important work. Perhaps it was partiality; but it was stated that that army did what no other army could do. That was an American army; that army was the product of these "miserable schools," this "miserable instruction." This course of instruction has produced an army, which, it has been said, over and over again, accomplished what no other army ever did. That will be admitted. We have competed with the world at London and at Paris, in the various departments of mechanical industry. In the utilitarian processes we have been beaten; but in all that pertains to human well-being, in the arts, we were so far ahead of the rest of the world that there was, really, no comparison to be expressed. I do not think any gentleman is to be thanked because he tears up an education by the roots, which has produced such results. I have heard these attacks, and especially this fighting of grammar until I am heartily tired of it.

Mr. Morse responded that he would not depreciate what has been done; but he thought what had been accomplished, far below what ought to be aimed at and expected.

Prof. Atkinson agreed with the remarks of the gentleman from *Dorchester*, in regard to the army. But the difficulty with the schools is, that, while every boy and girl learns to read and write, nine hundred and ninety-nine in a thousand of those who entered the army, never passed much beyond that in the district schools. They taught themselves, afterwards, by the light of the newspapers. He was recently told, in *Lewiston, Me.*, that the man almost entirely depended upon for the building of those mills, was one who could not be found as the product of any college, but was a self-educated man.

EVENING SESSION.

The Institute met at 8 o'clock, agreeably to adjournment, and the lecturer of the evening was at once introduced,—*Prof. J. Bascom*, of *Williams College*, who gave an interesting lecture upon the general subject of education.

On motion of *Mr. Harrington*, of *New Bedford*, a unanimous invitation was extended to *Dr. H. Barnard*, Commissioner of Education, to address the Institute, for the purpose of giving such statements as he saw fit in regard to the objects accomplished and projected, by the Department of Education. He spoke substantially as follows:—

REMARKS OF HON. HENRY BARNARD, LL. D.

Members of the Institute, Ladies and Gentlemen:—I will not trespass on your patience, having already occupied so much of your time this afternoon, by any extended explanation of the working of the Department of Education at this

time. But I am very much obliged to you for the opportunity of at least stating the present position of this national agency in the work,—or if not in the work, the recognition of the work of education, in this country.

The name "Department," probably, in the minds of many, led to an expectation of its power and position in the organizations of the country, which really the force connected with it and the special work assigned to the commissioner in the law establishing the Department, did not contemplate. I suppose the friends of education, in designating this Commission by the name "Department" intended to remove it somewhat from the influences which sometimes direct the operations of Departments and Bureaus in the government.

Education in this country, unquestionably, in our past history, has been mainly State, municipal, or parental, acting through legal incorporation mostly denominational. It has not, except for special purposes of the army or the navy, been recognized by the national government. And yet, every teacher, every statesman, has felt that there was somewhere in the national organization a want of just such a collection and denomination of information as this; that, in the inventory of the nation's wealth and the nation's strength, it was important to know where the country was educated and where it was not; where the spirit of American civilization and constitutional loyalty prevailed and where it did not; where there were dense masses of ignorance existing, and how far that education could be improved and spread on the one side and how that ignorance could be diminished, on the other.

The philosophical student of history knows perfectly well, that the education of a people is the true measure of a nation's civilization; that, in proportion as education is distributed, just in that proportion are life and energy diffused

throughout the country. Every reader of the history of the inventions of men, knows well that they spring up only where activity is given to the general intellect; every one who looks into the agencies for the creation of wealth, knows that, in proportion as mind can be incorporated into the work of the hand, is the wealth of a country increased; and every student of history knows that this country was the only civilized country in the world, which had not in it some officer who could give some account of the public or private education of the country. Every visitor to this country was struck with the fact, that there was no place where he could go and get information respecting the education of the country. It has been my fortune, for the last twenty-five years, to have visitors from abroad come to me to ask for this information; and they have invariably said there was no place where they could find that documentary exhibit of the state of the schools which it was their object in coming here to obtain.

Owing to this deficiency, the friends of education in the country have, for twenty-five years, pressed upon the government the importance of recognizing this interest. Some of us can go back thirty years, to a visit to the President of the U. S. and the Secretary of State, which led to the introduction, into the census of 1840, of the first national inventory of the schools and their teachers and pupils in the country. From that time to this, efforts have been made, every ten years, to introduce into the census further inquiries, and also to secure, through some department of the government at Washington, more minute and reliable data, of the progress of popular education at home and abroad.

In various ways, this American Institute of Instruction, and other National Associations for the advancement of education and science, have presented this subject separately and unitedly.

Two years ago, a memorial was drawn up by Mr. E. E. White, which was presented to the House of Representatives, and upon the strength of it, a Special Committee was raised to take into consideration this subject. The memorialists asked for the creation or establishment of a Bureau, in the Department of the Interior. The Committee of the House saw fit to report a bill creating a department, and in that form it passed the House, and by a still larger vote passed the Senate, and a Commissioner was appointed.

The law creating the department gave it an altogether inadequate force of clerks to enable it, in a moderate time, to present such a report as was contemplated, of the condition of education in the country. What could even the State of Massachusetts do with but a single officer to prepare the work which it was expected this department should do for the whole country. Here you have only to send out from Boston, a request on the towns, and you have a committee in every town, familiar with all the facts in that town, to make the return; and, unless that return is made within a specified time, there is a condition that the town declining or neglecting to make it, shall not receive its share of some distributive public fund. But in the case of this department, the Commissioner was expected to make a report of the condition of education in all the States and territories in all its departments, and to make specific inquiries into two subjects. And there were those in Congress so unreasonable as to suppose that this could be done in six months. There would not have been time to distribute the circulars, and get the returns fully, in that time. But, in addition to that, Congress required an examination into the state of education in the District of Columbia, a census of the whole District, and a report as to the relative efficiency of the system of education in the District. Now, I have no hesitation in saying, that

that work alone, was all that could have been reasonably expected to be performed by the Commissioner, with the clerks allowed him to co-operate with him.

In addition to that, the law directed that his first report should present a history of the land grants of the United States, a history which, I venture to say, does not exist in any State in this Union. I do not believe there is a western State that can present a document which will give the history of the funds that have grown out of the land grants to that State. I can only say that it was impossible to do the work which these resolutions required, within the time allotted by them.

But what has been done? I will state that, in the District of Columbia, the most minute investigation yet attempted in regard to any State, has been carried out there, and there is now a document in the process of printing which will exhibit the result, so far as that investigation is concerned. But one point to which sufficient attention has not been directed is the difficulties that the people of the District have encountered. It must be remembered that this District was taken directly out of the States of Maryland and Virginia. Here, in New England, we know something of the difficulties of arousing the public mind, and establishing habits which lie at the foundation of a good condition of public education. We have been at work thirty or forty years acting on the public mind, and on the legislation of the States, while the legislation has reacted upon the public mind; and yet, we have not really got the public mind up to the standard we desire. In the District of Columbia were people who had never been in the habit of acknowledging their obligations to provide for a general education, but where public schools were only regarded as for the poor; and there has been a constant struggle, in bringing up the schools to their present condi-

tion, against the habits of society. Year after year, efforts have been made to organize schools on the plan which we have adopted at the North, of public schools cheap enough for the poor and good enough for the rich. They unfortunately struck at the problem of getting up schools for the poor only. That is a problem that never has been worked out. A public-school, like a public road, must be the best school. There can be no set of public roads for the poor, and another set for the rich.

That has been the fundamental error in regard to education in the Southern States, — that public schools were only for the education of the poor. Better ideas are now prevailing. But I wish to have it understood that the District of Columbia labors under peculiar difficulties. Millions on millions have been realized to the government out of the gifts of the original property-holders in the District, while it has been looked upon as only a sort of camp, instead of being regarded as the capitol of a great nation, where the science and the wealth of the country should be exhibited, and where the schools should compare favorably with the best in the land; and where, to make them the best, the District should be properly aided, instead of being regarded, as it has been, merely as a sort of camp for public men to occupy for a few years and then leave, while they return to their homes.

The inquiry in regard to the schools of the District has been made in the most thorough manner possible. I have also endeavored to get information, and shall present it, as to the condition of some sixty cities of the country. The object is, to compare Washington with other cities, which have no system, and then with those which have a partial system, so as to see where the defects lie; and especially to make this comparison in regard to the matters of organization, supervision, and support; and then I shall present a

few examples of the most successful results in these respects.

But, in order that we may compare this country, in its cities, with the cities of other countries, I have endeavored to show what has been done in Germany, France, etc.

In addition to that, I have endeavored to inaugurate some system of inquiry by which the present state of education, in all its departments, and in every State, can be derived from year to year.

It should be remembered that this department has no authority in connection with the organization or administration of schools in the country. I have no right to call upon any public officer, state or national, for information, other than that which he may choose to give; and I fear the friends of education do not understand how exceedingly difficult it is to prepare tables on the subject of elementary, or other schools, unless the officer addressed with inquiries, shall promptly and fully answer, so as to enable the Commissioner to make a report. I am sure that I have many friends throughout the country; but I am confident many of them, to whom requests for information, that they could give, were sent, did not understand how important it was to have that information come at once. And yet, I have to make up tables for nine months; but cannot get, from my personal friends even, that information which I believe they would give to me as readily as to anybody.

If you want this department to be a medium of communication on the subject of education throughout the country, and if you wish to have it serviceable to you by giving you this information, you must give it your prompt, hearty, immediate co-operation.

There are some men, who are as able as any and as honorable in regard to public affairs, who do not believe that

education is a national concern. On the other hand, they believe that it is unconstitutional to do anything for it. They forget that we have appropriated more than fifty millions of acres of public lands for this purpose, and that they would have amounted to more than \$500,000,000 in value if properly husbanded; and that would make a most munificent appropriation for education. Now it is said that a country which has done all this, has no right to know what has become of the public lands and the manner in which these great trusts have been used.

I believe that, if any man was a fair exponent of what was necessary, and knew the difficulties we were likely to meet, it was that man who led the armies of the revolution, that man who was the President of the Convention that formed the Constitution, and wrote the letter expressing his views on this subject, in which he says, the object was to consolidate the union of the States, — that man who, in his first message and second message and in his fifth message to Congress, reiterated his recommendation that something should be done, by the general government, to promote the education and intelligence of the people. He recommended that there should be established at Washington a national university. He not only recommended that, but drew a bill, the language of which is almost exactly that used in the establishment of this department, coupling agriculture and education together, and pointing out the way in which it should be done, by establishing a board to procure and spread abroad the information that can be collected. And I say that we who love the Constitution and who love that man, feel that we are not far astray when we follow his example.

But there are those who oppose this department, on the ground that we should practise retrenchment; and some of that class of men felt that the retrenchment should begin

before this department was established. I believe they were as honest as you or I; but I still believe that they were mistaken. I believe it is easier to cut off some twenty or thirty thousand dollars from other departments, and better that it should be done, than to cut it off from the Department of Education.

There are others who think that some other person might do better than myself for commissioner. I should not disagree greatly with them. The House of Representatives thought it was best to discontinue the appropriation; but the Senate thought differently; and in a committee of conference it was thought best to grant the appropriation — not all that was asked for, — and after this year to make it an office in the Department of the Interior. I am not sure that would not have been the wisest in the beginning. But at least the action of the last Congress was in no respect unfavorable to the department.

Our present work is now to present as concise and as comprehensive an exhibit of the state of education as possible, embraced under these five great heads, and under the general head for the advancement of education and science, which shall show where we now are.

There will be no attempts to present new theories of education. I have no ambition to present my own views. But I do wish to get from every teacher, every administrator on the subject of schools in every part of the country, suggestions with regard to the actual necessities, and what they think should and can be done, to make our systems more efficient.

In connection with this exhibit of education in this country, I intend to show what is the state of education in other countries, under these heads. This could not be done, did I not at once step into the possession of an accumulation of material, which I have been thirty years in collecting.

With the small force allowed me, and with the co-operation of the teachers throughout the country, I hope to present these subjects within the next year.

In the circulars asking for information, I shall endeavor to state my questions as clearly as I can; and I shall send these circulars to every one who has shown any interest on the subject of education. The information thus obtained will then be printed and circulated. As far and as fast as I get information in regard to any statement, on any particular subject of education, I intend to circulate that, and continue the same course in regard to other points of inquiry.

I have been asked what documents we are ready to circulate. The document in regard to cities, will be through the press in a month. The report which I made to congress is now being printed, and that contains four preliminary reports on some subjects of inquiry. Not one of these reports is such a one as I hoped to make. But in the beginning of the last session, when it looked as though congress was disposed to discontinue the department, I thought it was due that what we had obtained should be put in some practical shape; so that, if the department were discontinued, there might be these proofs of what was the result of the nine months' work. I only say they are not specimens of the documents we hope to present.

But allow me to say, you must satisfy your members of congress that this subject of education is one that you have at heart; that you believe this, or some other mode, will help you in your fields of labor.

When those attacks were made on the department, it was said by members of congress, we do not hear from the teachers; there is no evidence that they care anything about it. And my belief is that it would have been lost, before it had had a single opportunity to show its usefulness, had not

some of the friends of education written to a few of the senators, who were thus stimulated to save it.

I trust I have not said anything to impugn the motives of any public man; I believe they have acted from the best motives. But I am satisfied, more than when I entered on the duties of the department, that, without any right or claim, or wish to touch the administration of schools in the States, this department may make itself felt, by the diffusion of information throughout the country, in such a way as to advance the cause of American popular, liberal education. (Applause.)

On motion of Mr. Cruttenden, of New York, it was voted, that the chair appoint a committee of five, to consider what action the Institute ought to take in regard to the matter presented by Mr. Barnard, in his address.

Messrs. Cruttenden, Northrop, of Ct.; Smith, of Mass.; Van Bokkelen, of Md., and Barrell, of Me., were appointed that committee.

Adjourned.

SECOND DAY.

Thursday, Aug. 6, 1863.

The Institute was called to order, by the President, at 9, A. M. Prayer was offered by Rev. Mr. Spear of Pittsfield.

DISCUSSION.

The Elementary Study of the English Language.

Professor S. S. Greene, of Providence, commenced by saying that there might be a wide difference of opinion as to the meaning of the term "The elementary study." If it meant merely the *acquisition* of the language, that was one thing;

but if it meant that, after a child has acquired language to some extent, how he shall proceed to *study* it, it is quite another thing. Suppose it were the question of the acquisition of the language, it could hardly be called a study.

A child begins to acquire the English language, as he begins to acquire any language he is called upon to speak, without any study, in the proper acceptation of that term. A child learns a language almost intuitively by imitation, because he feels a want of it; he is provoked to it, because he is stirred from within to use the language. And, as he hears others use certain sounds by which they make known their thoughts and feelings, he imitates those sounds, and thus utters his thoughts and feelings, and makes known his wants or his pleasures. He uses the language very imperfectly; but he begins to acquire it. If he sees a thing that pleases him, and hears his mother call it by some name, he uses that name; and there is an acquisition of language. I should not call that a study of the language. It does not seem to me that it is the proper use of the word "study." Yet I am not sure that was not the intention of the propounder of the question; and that he did not intend to bring up the whole subject of the acquisition of the language.

I will suppose the child goes further in his acquisition of the language; and, as he becomes interested more and more in the objects that surround him, and as his feelings may prompt him, he learns other words and learns to put them together. But his acquisitions will be entirely in accordance with the associations that surround him. He will use words as his father and mother use them, or his brothers and sisters and playmates do; and he will put them together as they do. If he falls into the society of those who speak good English, pure, chaste, and proper, he will grow up, he knows not how or why, a fine speaker of the English language. He will

use choice words, and put them together correctly, and use the language with taste. Has he studied to do it? That is the question. It appears to me there is no study about it, more than there is of anything that comes before him in nature. If another child happens to fall into the society of those who use the language incorrectly and improperly, he learns the language as they speak it. All his improprieties in the use of language are derived from them. He has a want and wishes to express it. His associates use improper expressions, and he uses the same, just as readily and freely as he would use the best expressions. He is not conscious of any impropriety.

Suppose he grows up in this way till he goes to school, and that these two children go to the same school, — one using the language elegantly, chastely, and the other imperfectly. They have been taught in one respect alike, through their associates, one, fortunately for him, well; the other, unfortunately, has acquired a bad habit of speaking, and the teacher must correct it. What shall the teacher do, under these circumstances, having pupils with all degrees of acquisition, from those who speak the language well or elegantly, down to those who speak with great incorrectness? Is that the question we are to discuss? If so, then it is a fair question before the Institute, — what shall be done to root out the faulty expressions which children have unfortunately learned from their associates? What shall be done to promote the study of the language, and how shall children make progress in the use of language? If those are the questions, they are important ones to be discussed. I apprehend that the question should be, — what shall the teacher do to instruct children, who come to him with all the different methods of using the language? That is a vital question. Shall the teacher put into the hands of these children a

text-book? Shall they learn the definitions of nouns, adjectives, pronouns, etc.; and shall they learn the rules of grammar, to correct the faulty use of language which they have acquired? To say that a noun is a name of an object, or give any other definition, will not meet the wants of the children, as I believe. When I was more familiar with schools than I am now, the teachers of primary schools, having children of from five to seven years of age, did not feel obliged to correct faulty expressions, but simply to teach the children to read and spell. And while they were reciting even, and using very bad language, it was all passed by.

It seems to me there is a fundamental error in elementary teaching, in respect to the English language. It is no matter how young the child is, no matter what his studies, no matter what he may be talking about; if he is conversing with a teacher and makes use of a faulty expression, he should be arrested at the moment and corrected. It should be understood that the child has learned these incorrect expressions from his associates, that they have become a habit, and he uses them he knows not why. When the teacher calls his attention, he is not aware of the faulty expression; and when the proper expression is given, and he is required to use it, he will use it for the moment; but when the interior want of language to express his thoughts comes up, he will use the faulty expression again. It seems to me that the teacher should do as a teacher of the French language would do. He leads the child to use a French phrase, because it is necessary to express the thought in a French combination of words. He is obliged, therefore, to give up the old expression and adopt a new one. It is of no consequence what the part of speech is; the expression is wrong, and should be corrected. For you to say that a verb is a word that signifies action, does not help him at all. He

has used a faulty expression, and you must teach him to use the correct expression in its place. The error is that primary teachers do not consider the language used by children enough. They should be led to believe that they are held responsible for the language used by children. If that were established as a principle of action with primary school teachers, much of the error in the use of language would be rooted out before it is time to study technical grammar.

Every primary school teacher should adopt this as a rule: that the faults of the children, in all their utterances, should be noticed. Whenever a faulty expression is used, the correct one should be given, and the child taught to use it, and this should be done every time the faulty expression is heard.

The teacher should take a high view of this matter, and do something more than simply correct such expressions as "them books": she should cultivate a taste for good language and a love of correct expressions. There is an opportunity now to cultivate the taste of children, to bring before them a variety of expressions, and show which are in good taste, and which will express thoughts most forcibly.

But there is one fundamental idea connected with this subject, and it will be fruitless to try to do anything unless the teacher proceeds on the principle that the thought must come first. The idea to be expressed must be one that the child has grasped fully. Of course the teacher must enter the realm of the thoughts of a child, and he should be the guide as to the kind of thoughts to be presented. The child has certain wants, being accustomed to a certain class of objects around him, which furnish him with ideas that are passing through his mind day by day, and of which he thinks and dreams. When he utters these thoughts, his expressions are full of life; they denote something that is in his mind. Every teacher knows the difference between the

language used when he wishes to express his own thoughts, and that employed when he expresses the ideas found in a book. When reading from the book, the tone of the child will often indicate that he does not know what he is saying, as the words are not understood. When he passes to the expression of thoughts on subjects with which he is familiar, his language is full of life, and it is uttered with proper emphasis, and his whole manner shows that he is uttering what is within him. That is the kind of language which children should use, and which should be cultivated before it is proper to have anything to do with grammar, as found in a book.

Suppose a child is using thoughts in this way, and uttering them freely, it does not follow that he will utter them according to the custom of good speakers. What shall be done? I know no other way but to meet the errors as they come up, and root them out by a persevering hostility to every one of them. If necessary, let them be written out or printed on the blackboard, and let them be scouted till the child gets rid of them.

Then the child comes under two influences in regard to language, — the influence of the school, and the influence of the home and of the street. Sometimes a child will show his school learning at home; but it is difficult to raise his feeling and sentiment high enough to lead him to abandon his home expressions, and take those which he is taught at school. While a child is reciting, he may use the school expressions; but when he gets excited, and tells what the boys have been doing in the street, he will use again the improper expressions. Nothing can correct this but the cultivation of a desire to improve in the use of language, and to get rid of the faulty expressions.

This is study of the language in the commencement, by

breaking away from faulty terms, and interesting the children in higher and better expressions. A child's language always comes in accordance with his wants. Increase the desire of a child for new words, and new words will come. In other words, stimulate him to higher wants and higher feelings, and you do much to encourage his proper use of language. When the language is demanded, you have an opportunity to come in and give the proper expression for the new thoughts. He who cultivates the thoughts of children will do most to cultivate their language. Their language will follow their thoughts, and continue to do so through life.

That suggests another thought, which is, to make the subject of language an indirect, but not a direct subject of teaching and discipline; let it come in as the means of expressing thought. All that the teacher can do to lead his pupils to think, from the objects around, from their reading or in any way, should be made the means of instructing them in the use of language. It is a great mistake not to lead children to think more; and by not suffering them to talk to us enough. Let them come and tell the little events that have happened in their plays; mark their language when they tell their stories; note the errors, and let them be brought up before them and the correction made; follow this process, and they will learn to use the language correctly, without any rules of grammar. Every teacher who is successful with children allows them to come up and tell their stories, and talk about what has happened.

Another thing. Children in primary schools should begin to write early on slates, and write sometimes expressions of their own. I do not know when this should begin; but there will be a time when they should write. When they do begin, by all means let them write their own thoughts in their own way. Then you may correct the faulty expres-

sions better than you can orally; for now they can be seen, and will make a stronger impression. Now is the time to begin elementary criticisms, to teach children about the use of the capital letters, and punctuation. They should be taught to write or print with facility. It is a good plan, at a more advanced period, but before studying grammar, to let a part of the questions in geography be answered in writing. It will take time, but it will accomplish much in learning to express thoughts properly: The slates may be exchanged among the pupils, criticisms made, and the elements of criticism discussed. Some of the forms of expression used might be put upon the blackboard. But this is not studying grammar; it is not yet time to study it. This work should go on till children reach high degrees of attainment, and have higher thoughts, and have had an opportunity to see and read; and then we may rise in our process of teaching language. We may then apply some of the technical principles of language.

Write a sentence, and they can see and examine it as well as they can examine a tree; the sentence may be divided into parts, and they can examine the parts, having their attention called to them, and having those that are defective pointed out. This will be entering upon the technical teaching of the language. Now their attention can be drawn to the words.

At length, it may be necessary to distinguish a word which represents some one of the objects with which they are familiar, and they can find that one name applies to one object, and another to another; and they will find that there are words in the language, which apply, all through, to objects. Thus they have advanced in an easy way, all the time correcting the language used, and all the time endeavoring to elevate their language; all the time learning to express their

own thoughts, and acquire the use of the pen and pencil. In this way, all the parts of speech may be easily taken up somewhere; I do not pretend to say when. Somewhere, it may be profitable for a child to take a text-book, marking the distinctions of the parts of speech, and agreement of these parts with each other.

Then how shall the text-book be used? It seems to me it would be one of the most unfortunate things to take up the book, and learn it page by page, with the rules and exceptions and statements; it would be the worst thing that could be done. The child would thus be at once broken off from the natural order which he has been pursuing, for he would be drawn away from the subject to the book. If he learns a sentence, he learns it as a part of the book, and not as a definition of what he has been using before, as he ought to learn it.

He is now prepared to learn the definition of a noun, of a verb, of any part of speech. Let him learn it, and then apply it and make the distinction, as he may be called upon to do. But he will not commit the whole to memory; what he has learned will be scattered in different parts of the book. The teacher may guide him, and direct him to the particular part of the book that is applicable. He may then learn the connection between the words, and he may do that in his own language or from the text-book.

So, part by part, in the whole course, he is advanced until he is prepared to take the text-book and learn the principles, and apply them skilfully, thoughtfully, understandingly. This whole thing is a matter of growth; the child grows up to it.

There is one thing especially to be remembered; that we are apt not to take up the study of the English language as a *vital* matter. It is treated too much as if it were a *dead*

language. We are too apt to take the language and analyze and discuss its principles, far in advance of the thought and capacity of children, rather than the language which they express themselves. We make a mistake in this, as we do not fall into line with their sympathies and go on in teaching the English language in connection with their thoughts. If the teacher, after the children have reached the point when it is proper to take the text-book, keeps up the habit of giving living forms of language that children will understand, teaching the English language will be no more difficult than any other teaching.

I do not know that I have met the wants of the subject; but, if I have not, I do not feel wholly to blame. (Applause.)

Rev. H. F. Harrington, Superintendent of Schools in New Bedford. I think all who have looked at this question practically must have been deeply interested in the remarks of Prof. Greene, every word of which applies directly to the question. The margin is very wide, as to the time when the different stages of the process shall be commenced.

I rise not to controvert, but to endeavor to supplement, the remarks that have been so ably presented. First, as to the viciousness of language and its correction. This is a point that stands a good deal by itself. In the schools under my charge, the teachers are directed, in every instance, to correct the faulty language used. The direction does not always succeed, because the instruction of the school is overcome by the influences of the street and the associations at home. We require, to prevent this, a report of every error detected at home or among companions, or even in the teachers. These errors are written down by the teachers, and this is a perfectly effective method of securing a correction of the error. Instances were given by Mr. H. to show the interest taken in this method, and its success. Other

methods may be employed, and it is a matter for study, on the part of teachers, how to run the school-work into the ordinary use of language outside.

The gentleman from Dorchester (Mr. Smith) said yesterday, he was tired of so much talk about grammar. But we must talk about these subjects, so long as there is a consciousness in our minds that the right thing is not done in our schools in connection with them. In politics we have certain phrases coming up month after month, and year after year, and men do not tire of them, because they are symbols of ideas, great leading principles. Just so the word "grammar" now stands out as a symbol for teaching our children how to use their native tongue, which they do not now do; and how to think, as they do not now.

In this connection, Mr. Harrington referred to the fact, as he understood it, that the examinations for admission to the high school are a type of the kind of instruction given in the grammar school. The questions prepared usually involve a good deal of the technics of grammar, parsing, etc. I do not think, said he, that technical grammar can find a place, to any great extent, in our grammar schools. When you take into account the time we have to bestow on every subject, and the deficiencies that now prevail, there is no time to do much of this technical work. It may be all admirable; but we cannot afford it. I would do very little technical work; but would endeavor to bring up the powers of the children to express themselves in their own language.

At the examination for admission to our high school, the children understood that they were to be judged by their spelling, punctuation, etc., in their grammar exercises, where they had to write out what was dictated, and that their examination would be confined to that paper. Their papers were correct, ninety per cent. of them. But when it came to the

other papers, geography, history, etc., where the mind was not on its guard and was acting freely, there were great errors. How can we get the matter of correctness into the minds of our children, so that correctness shall be a vital matter with them daily? It is a great study; but it can be done, and it must be done.

Mr. Morse spoke in terms of approval of the remarks of *Prof. Greene*. He thought teachers were not aware how much of the language of the school-room was not understood by the children. Much time, he thought, was lost, for the want of making the subject of study fully understood.

Mr. Cruttenden, of New York, referred to the two systems of teaching grammar, or methods of commencing. The older and more prevalent method was that which he styled beginning grammar-end first; but the better method was to begin thought-end first.

All teaching should proceed in harmony with the fact, that the mental faculties are threefold: perceptive, retentive, and applying or using, which case may be called the inventive faculties. The period for learning languages most easily is before the age of ten years. Terms and technicalities are then more easily remembered than at a later period. It is important to know at what time to cultivate particular faculties. I would, by all means, use the slate as much as possible, to produce accuracy in language, because this gives the benefit of sight as well as hearing. He referred to an acquaintance, a Russian boy, who speaks seven different languages. In Europe it is common for persons to speak from three to five languages with accuracy. Why? Because when young these languages are presented "thought-end first." Grammar need not receive a fiftieth part of the time and attention we give to it, if properly commenced.

Prof. Greene. I did not suppose that the question to be

discussed would lead to the general question of grammar. I believe that grammar is not unimportant at a proper time. I think it is an important element, after a child has learned the use of language correctly as we have supposed. The difference between a person who has acquired language by a proper use of it, and one who has acquired it by the study of grammar, is very great. If a child has some knowledge of language, if he has not studied the principles of the language, the philosophy of it, and has no technical knowledge, he will not know whether he is right or wrong in the expressions he uses. To know this, let him be thoroughly furnished with the principles of grammar, and he has the test.

Another person, who has no such test, will go on tremblingly, using expressions with embarrassment, and will wish he had studied grammar. What is grammar? Nothing more than an analysis of language. The principles being expressed in forms, and their philosophy understood, one has a test by which he can try all his expressions, at the proper time. Every child should study grammar. This I wish to say distinctly. He should understand the analysis of the language.

Rev. Charles Hammond, of Monson, said he agreed as to the importance of the study of language at a certain age. In elementary studies, in every language, English or Latin, what shall we say of this so-called practical method? Take a boy of seven or eight years, and he must learn the forms. Every boy, bright or dull, will find that the declension of nouns and the conjugation of verbs, is a work,—not play. And the attempt to learn is one that requires patience and self-denial. It is merely the training of one faculty at first; but is it not worth while to train that one faculty with a view of the use to be made of it? It seems to me that the memory may be trained so as to become a humble servitor, waiting on the mind and furnishing it with all sorts of facilities for

furnishing the reason. I would like to inquire of the gentleman from New York (Mr. Cruttenden), whether he would preclude the training of the memory, for the sake of improving the memory itself.

Mr. Cruttenden. The question has been asked me, whether I think it well to give the memory a certain practice, as in the conjugation of verbs and declension of nouns. That I may not be misunderstood, I answer, *no*. We appeal to the memory too much. Nothing has gone further to create this disgust for the study of our language than this constant appeal to the memory. Memory universally fails first, of all our faculties. Association is the important power to be cultivated. Memory should be to the mind what the hand is to the body, — simply a means of holding an idea until it can be associated with something else, and the relation clearly seen. Then the retention of the fact will not be a matter of memory, but of association. This idea was illustrated by a statement of the manner in which the speaker would teach Latin to a beginner. He said he would use memory as he would his hand, — to get knowledge, but not to hold it. I do not hold my property in my hand, although I acquire it with my hand. It is like the stomach, which is to digest our food. We might as well attempt to put food enough into the stomach for the next four weeks, as to attempt to make the memory the “servitor” of so many matters of knowledge, and trust to it. The over-exciting of this one faculty, and not using the other faculties, is a bad method for the school-room. Persons who use their memory only, and do not use their other faculties, are always short-lived.

John D. Philbrick, Superintendent of Schools in Boston, expressed himself as disagreeing with the last speaker in some of his views. He thought that the ideas advanced in regard to memory, particularly, were exceptionable. He

regarded association as a part of memory, inasmuch as it was the means by which we retain what we learn.

Mr. Elbridge Smith, of Dorchester, then read a paper upon "*School Records.*"

AFTERNOON SESSION.

The afternoon session commenced with a discussion. Subject, "*The True Order of Studies.*"

J. W. Dickinson, of the Westfield Normal School, opened with a valuable paper.

[This paper could not be obtained for the present volume on account of Mr. Dickinson's absence from the country.]

Dr. Lambert, of New York, followed, stating that an important consideration as to the order of studies for each individual, would be dependent on the question of the probable longevity of the individual; secondly, upon the length of time he can give to study, provided he can live as long as the average term of human life; and thirdly, it would depend somewhat on the manner in which a study is to be pursued, — whether systematically or analytically. The theory of the speaker, somewhat peculiar, based upon these three considerations, was illustrated at length. He thought there should be no order of study for every one; but *orders* of study, one adapted to one person and another to another. He closed, by urging the importance of studying the probabilities, in regard to the length of life of pupils, and their circumstances, before deciding as the course of study for them. He thought what is called free education a humbug. Something more than tuition must be provided, before all will get an education. Many a young man and young woman, thirsting for an education, cannot even provide for the food and clothing of the body.

Mr. Ladd, of Providence, expressed his satisfaction with the remarks of the last speaker, and went on at some length to advocate, as another important means of determining what a course of study should be, a knowledge of the principles of physiognomy, so that a teacher may learn to read the character of his pupils from their facial manifestations. No teacher who cannot do this, he thought, could succeed well in managing a school; and no one who could not thus judge of character, was prepared to recommend a course of study.

President Hopkins, of Williams College, was invited to express his views upon this question. After alluding to some of the positions taken by the last two speakers, he went on to say, that, in order to teach, the first thing required, as he believed, was to know what you have to teach. Where there is a failure of a teacher, he thought the want of such knowledge was the primary cause. He found that the teaching in normal schools was just like any other teaching. His original conception of a normal school was that it was a school in which persons were *to be taught how to teach*; but when he came to observe the processes of his friend, Mr. Dickinson, and others, he found that their business was, *to teach*. How was it with many of the teachers? Did they not know the rule when teaching arithmetic? Oh, yes; but they did not know the reason of the rule, and therefore they could not teach the reason of it. To know results is one thing; to know the steps by which you reach those results, is another thing. Thousands of men everywhere can act correctly upon the knowledge they have: in the legislature they can vote right, and they understand the subject on which they act; but if they were to undertake to tell the reason for their action, or state the steps by which they came to their conclusion, not one in twenty could do it. Now what do they know? They know how to vote; but do not know the pro-

cesses which their minds have gone through, to reach that conclusion; and therefore they cannot tell. That is what makes the difference between men, in their ability to make a speech. One says, it is so, and I know it is so; and another can go on, and in order, tell you how he reached the conclusion. If a person is to tell a thing, he must know it first; and I think that, generally, when a man knows a thing, he can tell it.

Now, my own impression is, that, if teachers know what they ought to teach, and how they ought to teach it, they will so present it as to carry conviction to the mind. With an apprehension of what the students are and what they want, you can present the various subjects, if the subjects are properly selected, in such a way as to carry conclusions right along; and, step by step, they will go with you, being interested more and more as you go on.

Here I may say that I differ altogether with my associate (Prof. Bascom), who spoke last night to you, as to the material for a college class. So far as I have observed college classes, if what is taught them is properly put, they increase in interest, and that interest waxes instead of waning, and is stronger at the end than at the beginning. I believe, if the right class of studies is selected, and if the order is arranged as it should be, that God has so constituted the material of knowledge in this world, and the mind that is to know, that there is in the constitution of the mind such a relation to the material of knowledge, that this material stimulates and excites man, and you have only to present this material of knowledge which God has furnished, to bring up the large mass of those who come to you to be taught, to a healthy, strong and vigorous application of their minds to these subjects. (Applause.)

We have never had, until the present year, any prizes. I

have never cared that (snapping his finger) for them. They may come in incidentally; but I do not deem them necessary at all. (Applause.)

If teachers have a proper conception of teaching, and if subjects are properly presented by them, whether you have young men and young women together or separate, there is enough of what God has given in the material of knowledge, for the excitement of the mind, to stimulate and quicken, nourish and strengthen it, and bring it up to a high platform. If teachers understand what they would teach, and make it clear, and not mystify anything, there would be no difficulty; and it would be the same thing for the common school all the way up, as I understand it.

The subject was then laid upon the table.

RESOLUTIONS ON DR. BARNARD'S ADDRESS.

Dr. Van Bokkelen, for the Committee on Dr. Barnard's Address, reported the following Resolutions, which were unanimously adopted:—

Resolved, That this Institute regards the establishment of a National Department of Education as of the highest importance, both to the general welfare of the republic, and to the educational interests upon which this welfare depends.

Resolved, That the steps which have already been taken in this direction, and the results secured thereby, amply compensate for all expenditure of labor and money; and give promise of yet more valuable and permanent results to be secured.

Resolved, That what has been already accomplished by this department, should not be taken as the full measure of its power and efficiency, which time alone can develop.

Resolved, That the statistics of the rise, progress, and present condition of education, are equal in value to those of any other department of public interest, and ought to be collected by the general government through a specific agency, such as that of the Department of Education.

Resolved, That we recognize HENRY BARNARD, LL.D., as eminently fitted to organize and conduct the affairs of this department, both by his

previous pursuits and possession of a large library of educational statistics, and his general acquaintance with educational interests.

Resolved, That a Committee be appointed by this Institute to prepare and present a memorial to Congress for the continuance of this Department.

John D. Philbrick, of Boston; S. S. Greene, of Rhode Island; Charles Hammond, of Monson; Homer B. Sprague, of Connecticut; and Nathaniel T. Allen, of Newton, were appointed the Committee, in accordance with the last resolution.

DISCUSSION.

The next subject in order was "*The Course of Study in Grammar Schools.*"

Rev. J. H. Twombly, Superintendent of Schools, in Charlestown, was invited to open the discussion upon this question. He said:—

The question assumes that there is, or ought to be, a *course of study* in grammar schools. The language of the topic to be discussed implies that there is to be study. I have no hope that our children can be rightly educated without *study* on their part, and that kind of study which is really hard work, taxing brain, muscle, and nerve. And there is to be a *course* of study. In some towns and cities this now exists, and I suppose, from the information I have gained, that in many cities and in many prominent towns, there is no well-defined course of grammar-school study.

I will first call your attention to the necessity of such an arrangement. One reason for a well-defined course, in every large town or city, is that where there are several grammar schools in the place, and children are moving from one portion of the city to another, it is of great importance to them that they may pass from one grammar school to another, and place

themselves in the same relations, in the educational work, that they held in the school they left. Where there is no uniformity in this respect, as to the length of the course and the studies pursued at the different stages of that course, the scholar thus removing from one part of the city to another, may lose a year, in consequence of the change.

By system more is accomplished in every department of effort than without. What would be the result, should the train start out without any calculation as to the distance to be made during the day, and each train run according to the fancy of the conductors? In every department, men see the necessity of system. While this truth is acknowledged and is carried out in practice, in every shop, and on every farm, and in every other department of business, there are thousands of schools in this great country that have no systematic arrangement of the work to be accomplished. Scholars come into the school when they please, take such studies as they please,—no one hand or combination of hands ruling or controlling that work. Every one knows how careful the engineer is, who has his hundred miles to make; how he watches his progress, so as to make each hour's distance within the hour; and the end is reached within a minute of the true time.

Suppose Mr. Weston, in making his great journey from the east to Chicago, had said, "I will do as well as I can in one day," and, feeling a little weary, had stopped the next day, and only had in mind that he was to reach Chicago, do you suppose he would have won the wager? Certainly not.

Before making up this course, in determining its length, the topics it shall embrace, and in executing this course of study for these schools, which are the colleges of the country, and which are the great schools of the land, it is important to take a broad view of the work of education. We ought

to understand the nature and the real or probable relations of those whom we teach, to each other and to society. We should have in view, continually, their mental powers, their moral susceptibilities; and we should never lose sight of the necessity of discipline and thorough training, in order to success in business. We should endeavor to understand clearly and to appreciate the moral conflicts in which they must engage in the great battle of life; the relations they will sustain as neighbors, as citizens, as princes too,—for every American boy, by and by, the gentlemen who stand up to address the Institute will say, has his hand upon the sceptre of political power.

We should expand our system of education, to embrace all the relations of children to their Creator. Any system that fails to grasp these great thoughts is deficient in soul, and must be deficient in results. We ought to obtain as clear a notion as possible of the divine possibilities. He who made man has not left man without instruction. Every hill, every valley, every dew-drop that sparkles in the sun, every star that gleams out before us at night, is an educator. The written word is another; the anointing spirit that comes to the human heart is another; and, in my judgment, the educator, who goes to his task with fifty or a hundred spirits throbbing before him, and who never has dreamed of the sympathy of the divine spirit, in connection with man, has not a clear conception of his business. We should understand the relations of man to the future; and these are some of the things that should engage attention in preparing a course of study.

We should consider the diversified condition of children to be educated, intellectually, physically, morally, and socially, and the time that they may probably be held in the school. I consider it one of the great errors in the school system in

this noble commonwealth, and in New England, that the course of studies is arranged with reference to a series of steps to the university. I am in favor of young men going to college. But, while we arrange on the one side for the one in a hundred who will go through college, I say, we should have another side of that programme, adapted to the ninety-nine in a hundred who will never go there. Suppose we make an arrangement, requiring seven or nine years of study, knowing that seven-eighths of the children will be out of the school in three years; and yet we do this upon some fanciful philosophy; practically we rob these children of their opportunities, which are few and limited.

If our vision extended beyond the counting-room, the work-shop, the factory, and the high school, we should inquire what shall be this course of study, in reference to time, and what shall be its character? If we have two or three grades of intermediate schools between the primary and the grammar schools, it will make a difference in our arrangement.

I prefer to speak of the course adopted in Charlestown, which extends over six years. I prefer this length of time, based on a well-digested primary-school course, requiring the reading of easy prose, and the spelling of common words, the use of the pencil and slate, the knowledge of numbers so as to perform simple examples in addition and subtraction on a slate, a proper training with reference to the sounds of the letters and similar topics; and I would have this course sustain an honorable relation to the high school. The grammar school should stand out before the public in an honorable position, so that a boy or girl, who had finished his course in the grammar school, should be permitted to step into the high school.

I deny the right of any committee to make a fictitious standard of admission to the high school, so as to debar children from admission to it.

What shall the studies be? I do not stand here to recommend twenty or thirty new topics. We must keep to the old lines, pretty nearly. We must have reading, and it seems to me we may make a decided improvement in this branch. I have found that, in many places, reading is limited to comparatively a few lessons; and these are read until all interest in them is lost, and they become a task. While there are a few well-selected pieces for vocal gymnastics, there should be a variety. And the teacher should have the liberty to say, If you do well to-day, you shall be permitted to take home with you this beautiful book, with large type, to read. In that way an interest would be excited in the art of reading, by the use of books from the school library, if there were one; and there should be one at the command of every teacher.

I would give to every child work in numbers, or arithmetic, the first quarter in the grammar school. I would do this philosophically, and in accordance with the doctrine propounded by so many able speakers in this Institute, arranging the studies according to the nature of mental development. There is a time before children reason. I recognize the moral faculties as opening first. The gentleman who told us that every child reads the teacher was correct; and it is unfortunate that many a teacher cannot read the children. There is a better knowledge of the moral sentiments of an individual than anything else. Next, curiosity should be employed to excite interest. Let every school-room be made attractive, with more or less of pictures; and present lessons on the slate or blackboard as much as possible, in order to have the aid of sight as well as of the ear.

Then will come the period of comparison, or the period of thought, when the child learns by imitation, and when he will learn the processes of arithmetic, though it may be somewhat by rote, as readily as he will five years later.

But he cannot now reason. At this point a great mistake has been made. We have introduced, at this unreasoning period, mental arithmetic. Perhaps, in the hands of some skilful teacher, it has worked admirably; but in the hands of most it becomes dull and dry: it is the opiate of the system. I have seen scholars go through the rigmarole, who knew nothing about the "therefore" which they used at the close; only they will say, that is something that comes near the close. Children nine or ten years of age will cipher smartly, and then they will work out the problems in mental arithmetic with interest.

It is a painful fact, that, after all our boasted improvements in the public schools, something like three fifths of the best pupils of the grammar schools leave them without graduating, or even the shadow of a grammar-school education, ignorant of history, of grammar, of arithmetic, beyond the first seventy-five or a hundred pages, having studied a few pages of mental arithmetic per annum, and most of the time, with little interest in it.

I am not opposed to the study of mental arithmetic; but I would have it studied at the proper time. I think it should extend through the whole course of the grammar-school instruction, and up into the high school.

A great deal has been said upon the study of grammar, and the use of certain terms. I think grammar is the art of speaking and writing language correctly. The word comes from *grapho*, to write; and that word, "to write," grammaticalizes. If one writes correctly, he writes good grammar. There is a great terror in all the land about grammar, and many a child thinks of it as a tiger, ready to spring out upon them. Why, it is speaking; and the little child who says, "I thank you," is using grammar. And if a child says, "John done that," and the teacher corrects the expression, he has grammar,—so much of it.

I would have grammar commenced very low, even in the primary school, and carried on in the intermediate and grammar schools, with regular exercises, and would have the exercises written out on the blackboard. We make a great mistake in separating the teaching of language and grammar, as different things. It is to teach the children to speak and write correctly, and know why they do it.

We ought to have, in all grammar schools, book-keeping and forms of business taught. I have been surprised to find that, in many places, the great mass of mechanics go out into the life without any knowledge of business forms, having never written a letter, bill, note, or receipt, and having received not the slightest instruction in book-keeping. In Charlestown, we have introduced book-keeping by simple entry, to the great satisfaction of the parents and masters of our children. It is a great error to put all the finishing up of this work for the first class. There are not so many scholars to finish up their education in the last year. Most have left the school before that time; but those who do finish up the studies of the grammar school, do generally go to the high school.

My sympathies are strongly enlisted for the large class of children who receive no special attention from the principals of our grammar schools. In many grammar schools not more than ten or fifteen complete the course of study annually. All who enter the grammar school ought to have some instruction in regard to business forms.

The studies I have named are those which, I suppose, will always remain in the grammar schools, and which are to be made interesting by all the means at the command of the teacher; and which can be learned only by thorough, hard work. I have no faith in the easy processes of teaching. I remember once listening to the pretensions of a travelling

lecturer on grammar, who claimed that he could teach it in four lectures. When going home, a youngster, one of my companions, said, "After all, I'll bet he can't learn grammar without study." There is work in it; and the scholar should be made to feel that he has duties. I would not put a long face on the idea of duty, however; but would inculcate the idea that the teacher should be happy in his work.

I would advocate, also, gymnastics, or physical culture; I would urge it as a moral duty. And when parents shall understand this better, and when they shall cease to sin, as many of them do, in the matter of dress and against the laws of nature, we shall have less for the undertaker to do, and a larger number of venerable men and women around us in life.

I would have more composition and declamation as regular exercises in the grammar school; and, in connection with every school, I would have a cabinet of minerals, and specimens of the curiosities of nature. I think the time will come when the grammar schools of the State will have these things. My friend, the Secretary of this Institute gave a lecture to his school on the subject of copper, and invited another gentleman to give a lecture on iron; and specimens were brought in and examined; and the result was that an interest was awakened, and the children were out in the field collecting specimens of minerals.

I am deeply convinced that we have not worked, as we ought, in a systematic manner. I know of no school where anything like systematic instruction is given in good manners; and yet the Constitution of this old Commonwealth requires that. I do not know of any schools where anything like systematic instruction is given in morals; and yet the Constitution of our State requires this. I may seem to some to be stepping over the limits of grammar-school instruction when

I urge this, and recommend it as deserving regular and formal attention. Unless we can do something for the manhood and womanhood of our children, we might as well shut up our school houses, and let the children remain at home. The great aim of the school has been to make accountants, and make good boys for the shop. The sooner we try to develop thought and character, the sooner shall we perform our mission. I would rather have a boy who could only read blunderingly from a common newspaper, and who has been well instructed morally, than to take the chances of a boy who has been trained in all the branches of a common education, but whose moral education has been neglected. Now, if one can practise dishonesty on a large scale, he is called honorable; if he can cheat a man out of a million, he can wrap himself up in his respectability and walk in any society. It is time to teach veracity. What covered our country with blood? More than anything else, it was the persistent lying of our public men. It is something of this spirit that is ruining scores of our young men now. We are in fault in regard to this matter. My proposition is, that we meet the crisis; or, if we cannot stand up to the responsibilities of the time, we had better pass away and let others take our places. (Applause.) Let us, while we aim at the best kind of intellectual culture, do all we can to promote the manhood and womanhood of the children committed to our care. (Applause.)

Rev. Charles Hammond. I feel that, practically, this grammar-school question is one that is not duly considered. From the statements of the gentleman from Charlestown, we learn several facts, which are almost appalling, if universally true. That is, that in these schools of learning in the vicinity of Boston, three fifths of those who enter the grammar schools, do not finish the course. According to statements, coming

from several sources, it seems that the grammar schools do not accomplish the work which should be expected of them; that very few of all who enter the primary schools, go through the grammar schools; and that hardly one tenth of one per cent. go through the high schools; so that "there is something rotten in the State of Denmark," or in Massachusetts, at least. I do not believe that, in the country towns, in the valley of Berkshire, and elsewhere, the schools are so bad as that.

We cannot have too good a system, and it becomes a question of importance, how much we can do with the system which we have. I think that the most that we can do in the grammar schools, is to have two grades; and it is a matter of great practical concern, with a great majority of the children, to know what can be best done during the time that the law requires these schools to be kept annually. No matter is more practical or more important. I think there should be an earnest effort made to do the work of the grammar school well; that there should be an aim to secure discipline as one thing, expression as another, and the cultivation of the senses or an acquisition of facts as a third. We do not have six years, in the country, to do that work in. The country boy must do what he has to do, in about three years. I do not believe that so large a percentage of those who enter these schools, in the country, fail to go through. There is need of a reformation in Charlestown and Boston, if the state of things exists there which has been presented. And I do not think that reformation is to begin by amusing the children, merely to secure attention for a few moments. I believe that study is work, and every thing that is work is duty in this world. *It must be done*, even if with crying and tears, — it must be done at all hazards. Adjourned.

EVENING SESSION.

A very eloquent lecture upon "*John Milton as an Educator*," was delivered by *Col. Homer B. Sprague*, of New Britain, Ct.

THIRD AND LAST DAY.

FRIDAY, Aug. 7.

The Institute met this morning at nine o'clock, and was opened with prayer by Rev. Dr. Todd, of Pittsfield, who performed the same service for the Institute, at its meeting here twenty-five years ago.

DISCUSSION RESUMED.

On motion of Mr. Harrington, of New Bedford, the discussion was resumed on "*The Course of Study in Grammar Schools*." Mr. Harrington thought this the great question of the day, more important than the question of *classical study*, because the number of scholars is so much greater, and the relations of the scholars of the grammar school to the whole community, are so much more important than the relations of those attending the high schools. He did not propose to discuss the relations of the studies themselves, in grammar schools; he had done that sufficiently at Springfield, at the meeting of the Massachusetts Teachers Association, taking his lecture at that time directly from the practical work of the school-room. It was plain, from the reception those remarks received, that the people considered the subject an important one. Though there were exaggerated expressions used in that lecture, he did not know how men could be reached, sometimes, without their use.

It is the examination for admission to the high school

which determines what the course of study in the grammar school is to be, and governs that course throughout. The questions given to candidates for admission to the English High School in Boston, as printed in "The Massachusetts Teacher," were, every one of them, such as involve technical knowledge. When such lists as that are given, as preparatory to entering a high school, every teacher of the grammar schools will have that list, and make his whole course of teaching bend to it; or he will get as many similar lists as possible, and suit his course for his first class, during the last year, so that they may answer those questions. What else could he do? But what is wanted, is less hearing of recitations, and more teaching; and how can that be obtained when the questions are all marked out?

Mr. Harrington introduced some of the questions which he had prepared for the examination of scholars for admission to the high school in New Bedford. One of these was, "What do you think to have been the most important event in the history of this country?" To answer that, there must be some event named; and the events named by different pupils, would be as varied as the opinions of the pupils. Of course, no examiner was to take his opinion, and mark by that. This course of questioning would demand thought in those who were to give the answers; but when a teacher knows that a certain class of questions will be proposed, he trains his classes with special reference to them only.

Another question of the series proposed by *Mr. Harrington*, was, "Name the three military men who, you think have accomplished most for our country." The answers to that question were exceedingly interesting; the range of the military men was very wide. The answers centred upon Grant, Washington, and either Sherman or Sheridan. The pupils were to give their reasons for the selection made, and the reasons were excellent in many cases.

Mr. Averill inquired of *Mr. Harrington* what he meant by technicalities.

Mr. Harrington replied that he would soon answer; and named another of the series of questions proposed to his candidates for the high school: "No country has ever grown in prosperity as has our own; what was the cause?" There, said he, thinking must be involved; and in any such series of questions, the range of thought must be enlarged to answer them. To answer the questions commonly proposed, the memory only is aroused; while, in the other case, pupils must be wide awake, taking in all the antecedents, consequences and conclusions, because there is an effort to come at logical results; and in that case there is something worthy of the name of teaching. To the question, "If there were but five railroads to be located in our country, where should we need them most?" one boy replied that we should want them to be Grand Trunk Railroads, because we should want all the trunks carried. That, he would say to *Mr. Averill*, was a technical answer.

Mr. Averill responded, that he was satisfied that was technical.

Mr. Harrington said, resuming:—I call grammar stuff, because it is nonsense generally for children, being taught out of place. When it is taken out of its relations to the subject, and out of relations to scholars, it is doing injustice to those who are trying to get the right sort of studies into the grammar schools. No one can say anything against arithmetic, mental or written, or geography, or grammar; but the moment you take them out of their right relations, and make too much of them, you then do make most ridiculous "stuff" of them. The study of geography, as it is studied in grammar schools, is mere topography, and that is studied because the teachers are preparing their pupils for examination, with

reference to a certain set of questions. In some schools, grammar and syntactical analysis are more attained, simply to prepare for the requirements for admission to the high school. I do not believe there is a grammatical analysis in the world, which does not antedate both the necessities and the fitness of the scholars for its study; and yet hour after hour is spent in drilling in analysis, because they have to prepare for the high school in that way.

If grammar is equivalent to a full study of language, then we want to understand it; if it is simply the study of the relations of one word to another, then it is mere technics, and that is what is generally understood when the study of grammar is spoken of. It strikes me that this is a great subject and most important of all, how to bring up the studies of the grammar school, so as to make children think, instead of merely repeating lessons; how to do something that shall fit them to go out into the world and make the knowledge they have obtained, valuable. Our grammar schools ought to so train the minds of young men, that they can command their thoughts, and be able to express them in a popular assembly.

Mr. Cruttenden, of New York, wanted to know how *Mr. Harrington* proposed to give pupils a knowledge of language without using the technics of language. The science of language must accompany the names. It is an absurdity to think of teaching a language and not introduce technicalities. A language may be learned more easily before the age of ten years, than at a later period. The younger children are, the more easily they learn a foreign language. It is doing great injustice to pupils to dodge the real scientific names, when teaching them. The real scientific name is always the simplest that can be given. The child can just as easily learn the meaning and use of a word of many syllables, as of a word of one only, if he can say rain and bow, he can just as easily say rainbow.

Mr. Hammond thought it singular that persons known to be in sympathy with the School of Technology, which had been started within a few years, were found declaiming against technics so earnestly and constantly. *Dr. Bigelow* rather prided himself in having introduced a new word into the language—"technology"—not found in any English lexicon before. Now we have tirades against technics here, as hindrances and not helps. For my part, said *Mr. Hammond*, I consider them helps. Take, for instance, the chemical nomenclature, one of the most important inventions of the past century. It is hard work for beginners to study them; but that is no good reason for omitting to study them; for, when once acquired, they are most important helps. Take the lectures of *Prof. Agassiz*, and you will not find one which does not assume that those who listen have some knowledge of Greek; and therefore every one should know how important is the study of Greek to help thought and to facilitate it.

Hon. Joseph White, Secretary of the Board of Education, did not propose to go into the vexed question of the use of technics in grammar schools. He had enough of that when, at eight years of age, *Murray's* grammar was put into his hands, and he learned it forwards and backwards, and knew as much about it one way as he did the other. He wished to say a few words only of the relation of the grammar school to our general system of education. Out of the cities, the grammar school is a portion of the old fashioned common school, being the upper portion of the common school, except where there is a high school. And since three fourths of all the scholars in the commonwealth go no higher than that, enough knowledge should be given, either with or without technics, to fit them for the great duties of life. The danger is that in making the grammar school in cities the means of fitting for the high school, the boy must

stop before getting to the high school, and be obliged to go out into the world with a preparation for the duties of life far short of that which might once have been obtained in the old-fashioned common mixed school.

There are, in this commonwealth, four excellent normal schools, which are attempting to fit young gentlemen and ladies for the high business of teaching. Their object is to teach things first and names afterwards. That is about all there is of the matter of technics; and it makes no difference whether the word is long or short. But if the word is given as the means of teaching the thing, it is putting "the cart before the horse." We need, in the grammar schools, a healthy study of things in their proper order,—grammar, geography, arithmetic,—so as to prepare young persons for the duties of life, and fit them to go out into the world if they must, without entering a high school; for most of them can never go to a high school. There cannot be a long series of classes in the country, not more than two or three grades in villages of considerable size. The grammar school is the great people's school; and the studies should be arranged so as to give as much real preparation for the duties of life as possible.

Prof. Greene, of Providence, thought that, after all the discussion, there was really very little difference of opinion. Though one may denounce technics, and another defend them, every one will agree that the true method of teaching is to present the thing first and then explain it, and then let the term be applied. If a child happens to know the term and not the thing, no harm is done, for the time. But the true order was that stated by the Secretary of the Board of Education. It is simply a question of teaching; and all should insist on one thing: that the teacher should never allow any subject to go without explanation; so that the child

shall know the thing and the term at the same time, whichever may be presented first.

A. G. Boyden, Principal of the Bridgewater Normal School, agreed with the remarks of Prof. Greene. Teachers are hampered by what is expected of them in preparing pupils for the high school. In a majority of the grammar schools there is a great deal of mechanical teaching. What is wanted in all schools is to bring pupils to think more. The idea should be presented and acquired first; then the words. School superintendents and committees should give all the aid they can in this direction. Better means of illustration are needed in all schools. Teachers need a thorough knowledge of what is to be taught: they should arrange the work of the school so that it shall be level to the comprehension of children, so that it can be mastered and be interesting to pupils. The crying evil at the present time is, that pupils get the words of their lessons without ideas associated with the words. Scholars, old or young, will give quotations from the text-book, and yet have associated no ideas with them.

It is unfortunate that the study of grammar, geography, and arithmetic have been so much decried here and elsewhere. Young teachers not unfrequently ask, "What is the use of grammar; can we not learn all that is necessary without a knowledge of grammar?" And they quote the remarks of certain teachers of reputation derogatory to these subjects.

We are told that grammar is the science of language; and we are required to teach it, as well as analysis. If scholars should go out from the normal school who cannot teach these things, they would bring reproach upon their schools. Our pupils will do what is required of them, and teachers will also do the same. The first thing is, to meet the demands of the public; and the next is to understand how we can best

secure the improvement of our scholars, by the improvement of the teachers. The teachers must know what is to be communicated, and must have appliances to illustrate what is taught. How shall we improve our teaching? and how shall we obtain more appliances to aid teachers? are questions to which we need to give our most earnest attention.

The subject was then laid upon the table, and the Institute listened to a lecture by *William C. Collar*, Principal of the Roxbury Latin School, upon "*The Classical Question.*"

A discussion followed.

Hon. J. D. Philbrick expressed his gratification at the manner in which the subject of classical learning had been presented. The methods of teaching Latin, as recommended by the lecturer, corresponded with his own experience. The question, when the classics should be studied, was essential. He thought the method pursued in Boston, of requiring all the minutiae of the grammar to be learned, a very bad one. Pupils cannot enter the Latin School there till they are ten years old; then they pursue the course six or seven years, which seems contrary to reason. The two things needed, in order to reform present methods of teaching the classics, are to begin at the right time, and then to teach in the right way. Some take the grounds that the study of Latin should not commence till the age of sixteen or seventeen; and, beginning at that age, a boy can learn Latin enough in two years. Some boys in Boston have done that.

Mr. Hammond also expressed his concurrence with the views presented by the lecturer, in the main. He did not agree, however, that classical culture was losing ground in this country. He thought there had not been a full examination of all the facts in regard to the matter. He thought the knowledge of the present generation of classical scholars, was vastly higher than that of those who lived twenty years

ago. There has been as much improvement in this as in any thing,—science not excepted. The result of that kind of study, it is true, cannot be expressed in numbers. How can the resultant of ideas be expressed? But the right use of words, let what may be said about it, is the finest of all the fine arts. One way to make the comparison is to look at the subject historically. Two hundred years ago it was required for admission to Harvard, that they must study so much true Latin. What that Latin was is a matter of history. The quality required then was very different from the quality of that which is required now; and the actual amount which a boy must acquire now, is greatly in advance of the amount formerly required. According to the common idea of scholarship, in the early part of the last century, perhaps Cotton Mather is a type of the great scholars of Massachusetts, as Ezra Stiles is of those of New Haven. But if some of the scholars from Yale or Harvard now, were to read their productions, they would conclude they were not fit to enter a decent college. One of the best of Cotton Mather's productions, written in Latin, on the second coming of Christ, was introduced in this way:—

"Dietriba de signo fillii hominis et de secundo Messiaë adventi auctore Crescentio Matheo."

That was the title of his book; and by examining that, we may judge of the quality of Latin generally produced. We are not to lose our hold of the importance of classical education. There was much truth in the suggestions of the lecturer, in regard to needed reforms in the method of teaching the classics. The grammars in use are, perhaps, better adapted for mature scholars, perhaps even for college students, or for scholars in German or English universities, who spend years in classical study. Two hundred years ago, John Milton was a teacher, and he adopted a course of study

like that recommended here. There is such a thing as having Latin books for beginners, involving but a few, though fundamental, ideas. Two hundred years ago, most scholars were trained in that kind of Latin; and they did not go beyond that. Milton's letters, for instance, which he dictated when blind and old, are easy Latin. So the mediæval Latin is as easy as English to read; because they did not adopt the Ciceronian style, but took the highest type then existing, and required students to become masters of it.

Rev. B. G. Northrop, Secretary of the Connecticut Board of Education, concurred with the views of the lecture; but reluctantly dissented from the suggestion, as understood, which was advanced by Mr. Philbrick. I should deprecate the idea, said Mr. N., that Latin is not to be taken up until the age of fourteen or fifteen. It may, in some cases, have been commenced too early; but the subject should be appropriate to the order of the development of the faculties. The faculty of learning language is one of the earliest, as confirmed by the experience of teachers; and those who do not commence till the age of sixteen or seventeen, seldom become expert. When John Adams went abroad, his duty made it necessary for him to learn the French language; and he commenced with a tutor. But John Quincy, running about the streets, learned the language faster than his father; not only because he had a better method, but because he was of the right age. We should begin to teach languages at an early age.

Mr. Philbrick responded, that he would not take an extreme view; but he thought that from twelve to sixteen was the proper age, depending upon the scholar. No exact time could be specified for all. The case of Mr. Adams did not prove the position claimed by the gentleman, because Mr. Adams had his mind so much occupied with other things.

Mr. Hammond referred to the position taken by Prof. Taylor of Andover, that the memoriter method of study, used at Boston, was not the best; on the contrary, he said, the aim ought to be to elucidate principles, as the result of each lesson.

Mr. Philbrick continued, that, though Mr. Taylor might be a great teacher and learned man, he had published a book in which he had given a specimen of his method by taking a few lines of Virgil, and exhausting so much study upon them, that it would require the life of Methuselah to acquire a knowledge of Latin in that way.

Mr. Hammond replied that that was only a suggested method. And three or four years might be spent on a single page of Latin; and a single page of Homer will make a demand for a knowledge of all the Greek there is in the grammar.

Mr. Collar inquired if ninety-nine teachers in a hundred would not understand that Mr. Taylor advocated the most minute and exhaustive method of examination. There are some four hundred and twenty-six questions on the first few lines of the lesson given as an example by Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Hammond. If teachers so understood Mr. Taylor, then the book was open to objections.

Mr. White related an anecdote respecting a colloquy between Mr. Webster and Mr. Hunter, of Virginia, to illustrate the nature of the different opinions about Mr. Taylor's book.

Mr. Merrick Lyon, of Providence, had been much interested in the scholarship of the lecture; but differed as to the views presented. He objected to teachers using translations; did not believe a word in it. If scholars were to understand that the method proposed is recommended, they would be more than now inclined to disregard the grammar.

He would not undertake to put a boy through a book of Virgil in less than three months. He did not believe in bringing up children so tenderly that they cannot use their own faculties. They must be allowed to make mistakes; and, when they fall, let them get up. It will not make a man of a boy to stand by him and feed him like an infant.

Mr. Collar was not anxious to defend the points of the lecture; and he was glad to hear the remarks of the last gentleman. If the principles advocated were wrong, he wished to know why they were so, and in what respect. He had found Dr. Taylor's book very useful; but did not believe in the system which he understood Dr. Taylor to advocate. As to classical education being better now than formerly, he was not satisfied. It is true that the older writers wrote imperfect Latin; but scholars now do not write it at all. The gentleman from Providence does not believe in helping pupils; he would let a pupil walk as soon as he can. So would I, said Mr. Collan; but I would not put a babe on his feet at birth: I would help him. I propose that a pupil shall go on alone as soon as he can; but that, in his early steps, he shall have the assistance he requires. He requires this help, because the Latin and Greek are difficult languages, and we have no Latin or Greek written for boys. That which we have was written for men and by men; and must necessarily be difficult. I propose distinctly, that a pupil shall receive some help from his teacher, in his early steps, and that when he can go on alone, he shall do so. When he can use a lexicon, let him use it.

Mr. Hammond explained that, when Harvard was founded, he had no doubt that the average scholarship was as good as that in England; but he did not think Cotton Mather's style should be compared with that of the best. He did not ob-

ject to Latin translations in certain cases, nor to a teacher's taking a hard sentence, and reading it over carefully to the class, so that they may understand it.

Mr. Lyon still urged objections to the method proposed by the lecturer.

Mr. Smith, of Dorchester, spoke in favor of it. He thoroughly believed it was the best way for a teacher to read a translation to his pupils; only let it be done properly. It makes more work for the scholar; but it makes that work agreeable. He was almost prepared, from his own experience, to say that he knew it to be the right course. The truth is, we are all very much the creatures of habit; we went through all this rough and tumble ourselves, we remember very well:—

“Per varios casus, per tot discrimina rerum,
Tendimus in Latium;”

and we think our scholars must go through the same course. There is a more excellent way.

President White, of Cornell University, said that, in discussing this classical question, men start from different points of view. I, said he, start from the point of view, that for those who will study them, I know no better things to study than the classic authors. The study of the sciences does not accomplish the whole work, noble and important as they are. “The proper study of mankind is man;” and you cannot get at it unless you study the history of man, and literature, as unfolding that history. Then comes up the question as to how and when we should study it.

To take the first point that occurs to me, I do not see any such great cause for congratulation as to the progress of classical education at present. I look at the letters of Thomas Jefferson and of others, and I see that they could

read Cicero and understand him. I do not see such scholarship now; I see a very different sort, which seems to me to be essentially a science scholarship in many respects. I think one great trouble is a departure from the legitimate purpose of the study. Some study them merely for purposes of philology, while the great object of the great number should be for the sake of the classical literature. I appeal to you: I ask if that is not the object. When I went to Yale College, I remember I had some love for classical studies, having been under the tuition of a man who loved them himself. My idea was to get a good translation, and to get at the heart of the author. I remember entering the classroom, and I saw on the platform a tutor whose whole idea was to have a perfect lesson on the rules for the subjunctive mood. He cared nothing about the translation: the style of Cicero was nothing. There was one very bright scholar who came to the conclusion, after a few such questions as were put to him, that, to use his own language, he was not going through any such — nonsense. He utterly refused to answer any such questions on the subjunctive mood, although recognized as really one of the best classical scholars there. When I entered into Greek, I looked about to see who were the men that I would try to work up to. Among the first was a gentleman who rose and made a good translation: it was good English, representing the thought. I thought to myself, that is worth listening to. When questioned, he showed that he understood the subject. Another made a stumbling translation; and then he was asked the synopsis of a Greek verb. He went like a mill in his answer, and sat down. The gentleman next to me said, "That is the great oration man of the class." I entertain a kind of disgust for that kind of scholarship; I do not believe it will produce any great amount of mental culture.

As to the question of grammar, I sympathize deeply with those who would endeavor to get students at the literature as soon as possible. Let a boy learn to love the literature, and then let him look into the structure of the grammar, and it seems to me something would be accomplished. To get at the literature, Matthew Arnold says, is the only way to save the classics,—to bring men to study the literature at the earliest moment possible. That is the tendency of literary men in Europe now.

I would indulge in no tirade against classical education. I see men who give themselves purely to scientific studies, whose narrowness breaks out so that one scientific man will never say a fair thing of another. But we have got to come to a different method of teaching the classics, or they are gone;—unless you bring men, after six or seven years' study, to something like a knowledge of them. When a boy is brought to the study of Cicero, he must be made to understand the real merits of the author; and so of other authors. In ways like that, you can make classic scholarship live; if you neglect to do that, it is lost in this country. Adjourned.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

The Institute proceeded, as the first business of the afternoon, to the election of officers for the ensuing year. The following, as reported by the committee on nominations, were unanimously elected:—

PRESIDENT.—John Kneeland, Boston, Mass.

VICE PRESIDENTS.—William Russell, Lancaster, Mass.; Henry Barnard, Hartford, Conn.; Samuel S. Greene, Providence, R. I.; Ariel Parish, New Haven, Conn.; George B. Emerson, Boston, Mass.; Nathan Hedges, Newark, N. J.; Zalmon Richards, Washington, D. C.; John W. Bulkley, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Thomas Sherwin, Boston, Mass.; David N. Camp, New Britain, Conn.; John D. Philbrick, Boston, Mass.; Alpheus Crosby, Salem,

Mass.; Ebenezer Hervey, New Bedford, Mass.; Henry E. Sawyer, Middletown, Conn.; Edward P. Weston, Farmington, Me.; Emory F. Strong, Bridgeport, Conn.; D. B. Hagar, Salem, Mass.; A. P. Stone, Portland Me.; B. G. Northrop, New Haven, Conn.; T. W. Valentine, Brooklyn, N. Y.; J. E. Littlefield, Bangor, Me.; Joseph White, Williamstown, Mass.; Charles Hammond, Monson, Mass.; Abner J. Phipps, Medford, Mass.; John W. Dickinson, Westfield, Mass.; Merrick Lyon, Providence, R. I.; Elbridge Smith, Dorchester, Mass.; Samuel W. Mason, Boston, Mass.; A. A. Miner, Boston, Mass.; Albert Harkness, Providence, R. I.; M. C. Stebbins, Springfield, Mass.; Charles V. Spear, Pittsfield, Mass.; David Crosby, Nashua, N. H.; Wm. P. Atkinson, Cambridge, Mass.; W. E. Sheldon, West Newton, Mass.; Homer B. Sprague, New Britain, Conn.; George M. Gage, Farmington, Me.; George T. Littlefield, Charlestown, Mass.; J. P. Averill, Northampton, Mass.; F. F. Barrows, Hartford, Conn.

RECORDING SECRETARY.—D. W. Jones, Boston, Mass.

ASSISTANT RECORDING SECRETARY.—C. O. Thompson, Worcester, Mass.

CORRESPONDING SECRETARIES.—Wm. C. Collar, Boston, Mass.; W. E. Eaton, Charlestown, Mass.

TREASURER.—George A. Walton, Boston, Mass.

CURATORS.—J. E. Horr, Brookline, Mass.; Samuel Swan, Boston, Mass.; Henry C. Hardon, Boston, Mass.

CENSORS.—James A. Page, Boston, Mass.; C. Goodwin Clark, Boston, Mass.; Edward Stickney, Newton, Mass.

COUNSELLORS.—Charles Hutchins, Boston, Mass.; George N. Bigelow, Newburyport, Mass.; J. H. French, Albany, N. Y.; A. G. Boyden, Bridgewater, Mass.; W. A. Mowry, Providence, R. I.; N. A. Calkins, N. Y. City; J. W. Webster, Boston, Mass.; J. H. Twombly, Charlestown, Mass.; A. S. Higgins, Brooklyn, N. Y.; J. N. Camp, Burlington, Vt.; D. W. Hoyt, Providence, R. I.; E. A. Hubbard, Springfield, Mass.

The constitution was amended by substituting the word "*person*" for the word "*gentleman*," in the third article.

The constitution was referred to the Board of Censors for verbal revision, in order that it might conform throughout to the above change, and to the amendments heretofore adopted.

The following By-law was adopted:—

Each member of the Institute shall be assessed one dollar annually, the payment of which shall entitle said member to one copy of the publications of the Institute.

DISCUSSION.

The subject for discussion this afternoon, was: "*What Education should precede a strictly professional one?*"

Mr. John D. Philbrick, of Boston, being called upon to open the discussion, spoke substantially as follows:—

A "profession" we understand to be a calling or occupation pursued for a livelihood, which requires, for its successful pursuit, a certain amount of technical, special knowledge. A few years ago, the occupations styled "professions," were only these in number, viz: those of law, physic, and divinity. But the progress of modern civilization has in our day greatly increased the number of professions, or occupations requiring special learning, so that we now have, in addition to those already named, the profession of teacher, of editor, or author, of engineer, of chemist, of architect, and others. It is the function of professional education taken in its general sense, to impart the special knowledge required by these different callings. Professional education, in its strict sense, the sense implied in the question, is synonymous with *instruction* as distinguished from *discipline*. Its specific object is to impart knowledge, information, rather than to train and cultivate the faculties of the mind.

The law school aims to impart to its students only such knowledge as they will need as lawyers, and so of all strictly professional schools. There are, indeed, some institutions of learning, which, to a certain extent, combine general education with that which is strictly professional in its character, as, for example, the Institute of Technology, in Boston.

Now there is no question as to whether elementary education — that education which is deemed necessary for every person of whatever destination in life, including the branches of instruction usually embraced in the programmes of our pri-

mary and grammar schools—should precede professional studies. There is, however, much diversity of opinion as well as of practice, with reference to the nature and scope of the education which ought to come between this elementary instruction and that which is strictly professional in its character.

On the one hand, there are those who maintain that the student destined to a profession should, after completing the elementary studies, enter at once upon those branches which, if not essentially professional, are such as are necessary to an understanding of the technicalities of his profession, and that all studies which do not bear directly upon the proposed profession should be omitted. This theory seems to be advocated by Dr. Jacob Bigelow, in his able discourse on the "Limits of Education," delivered before the Mass. Institute of Technology. On this point he uses the following language:—

"Every individual is by nature comparatively qualified to succeed in one path of life, and comparatively disqualified to shine in another. The first step in education should be for the parties most interested to study and, as far as possible, to ascertain the peculiar bent and capacity of a boy's mind. This being done, he should be put upon a course of intellectual and physical training, corresponding, as far as possible, to that for which nature seems to have designed him. But in all cases a preparatory general elementary education, such as is furnished by our common schools, must be made a prerequisite even to qualify him to inquire. The more thorough this preparatory training is made, the better it is for the student. But, after this is completed, a special, or departmental, course of studies should be selected, such as appear most likely to conduct him to his appropriate sphere of usefulness."

This may be considered, perhaps, the extreme utilitarian theory. It seems to proceed upon the assumption that education is the process of acquiring useful knowledge, and nothing more. Or, at least, that it is the business of the educator to provide only for imparting such knowledge as can be used in the practical affairs of life, without regard to the disciplining effects of the branches pursued.

On the other hand, there are those who place the chief value of education in its discipline, caring little for the knowledge acquired in the process of school and college training.

The true theory, it seems to me, lies between these extremes. It does not ignore discipline, the cultivation and development of the faculties, and yet it does not teach with the sole view to culture and development. It has due regard for those branches of knowledge which are of obvious practical utility, and can be applied directly in business and professional pursuits; and yet it does not exclude from the curriculum every study which cannot make good its claim to be classed in the category of useful information.

All education which is intermediate between elementary and professional education in its restricted sense is of course general or liberal in its character, inasmuch as it is adapted to man as man, and not to the particular calling he may pursue. Its aim is to impart both discipline and knowledge, but only such discipline and knowledge as are best calculated to form and inform man, without regard to the vocation he may adopt. It has been well said, that men are men before they are lawyers, physicians, or merchants, or manufacturers; and if you make them capable and sensible men, they will make themselves capable and sensible lawyers or physicians. And in my view, it is precisely the function of general or liberal education to make capable, sensible, well-informed, cultivated men; and if I were to construct a curriculum for the educa-

tion of a first-rate engineer, I should endeavor to shape it so as to develop the qualities of a first-rate man, superadding the instruction in the technicalities of the profession.

The doctrine, then, which I would advocate, is this, that general education is essential as a preparation for professional education, and that the value of professional men, in the community, is determined, to a very great extent, by the kind and degree of their general education, or that which precedes their professional instruction. On this point I concur fully with Mr. Mill, in his address at St. Andrew's. He says, "Whether those pursuing the specialities of their chosen profession, will learn them as a branch of intelligence, or as a mere trade, and whether, having learned them, they will make a wise and conscientious use of them, or the reverse, depends less on the manner in which they are taught their profession, than upon what sort of minds they bring to it,—what kind of intelligence and of conscience the general system of education has developed in them."

One view of the scope of the question under consideration would involve the consideration of the best curriculum of general or liberal education, taking it for granted, as I think we should, that the student destined to a profession, should take as long and as thorough a course, preparatory to the study of his profession, as his circumstances will permit.

If we examine the present state of liberal education, in the sense in which we are considering it, as it exists at the present time in the most civilized countries of the world, we find that there are two distinct systems. One of these systems provides for instruction in a wide range of studies, comprising the classic tongues, mathematics, physics, chemistry, logic, physiology, psychology, natural history, ethics, political economy, æsthetics, and rhetoric. This course is the one curriculum of liberal education, without any option. This is substan-

tially the system of the Scottish universities, and it has been the system of most of our American colleges, till recently, and is now, perhaps, the prevailing American system of liberal education,—the preparatory course for professional study. The other system of liberal education provides for two independent and separate courses, each complete in itself. These courses have certain branches of science in common, especially the more elementary mathematical studies. They differ mainly in this,—that in one of these courses the classical languages constitute the staple of the studies, while in the other Greek and Latin occupy a subordinate place, are wholly replaced by living languages, and the mathematical and physical sciences are the leading studies. The best type of the former course is found in the German gymnasia; while the most perfect type of the latter is presented in the real schools of Germany. This system somewhat modified is now in operation in most countries on the continent of Europe.

The essential features of this system are now rapidly coming to be incorporated into our American collegiate and higher institutions of learning. This division of general education seems to be the result of two causes. In the first place, the limited time which most students are able or willing to devote to general education, rendering it necessary for them to make a selection from the studies which are considered as constituting a complete liberal education, as all cannot be pursued to advantage. And, in the second place, a course more strongly scientific is considered better as a preparation for the study of the practical professions, while a course more decidedly literary is deemed better suited to the wants of the professions of law, medicine, and divinity, of journalism, and teaching.

In France the subject of general education has received

great attention during the past half century. The final result reached through a long series of experiments was embodied in the law of the 21st of June, providing for a re-organization of the schools for general education. This law provided for the establishment of a new class of schools called special secondary schools, for pupils who are destined for mercantile, industrial, or agricultural pursuits. In these schools the ancient languages are not taught, and the course of study may be modified to meet any special wants of a community where such school is established. It provides also that in the lyceums, the other class of institutions devoted to general education, all pupils should, up to a certain stage, follow the same course, embracing Latin and Greek, in connection with mathematics and the natural sciences. In the latter part of the course, a division takes place. The students destined to the great special schools leave the literary studies and devote themselves exclusively to the sciences; while those destined to the literary professions, leave the scientific branches and pursue more exclusively the philological studies.

A careful survey of the whole field of higher education, cannot fail to produce the conviction that the elevation and improvement of the profession is to be effected mainly by improving the means of general education, and by requiring, as a condition of admission to professional studies, a thorough training in those studies and exercises which are best calculated to discipline the mind, and to cultivate the moral faculties,—in a word, to make men able and conscientious.

Dr. A. B. Palmer, of the Michigan University, Ann Arbor, respectfully dissented from the views presented, — that all education properly for the professions, should be of the same character. That idea, he thought, erroneous. A medical

man, for instance, requires an education somewhat different from that of a clergyman, before he commences his strictly professional studies. A lawyer requires a different preparatory education from that of an engineer.

Mr. Philbrick, (interposing.) I think I stated that to an extent sufficient to enable one to pursue a liberal education, all should have the same; but beyond that, it would be desirable to have a continuation of an education, not strictly professional.

Dr. Palmer. Then I understand that the gentleman would have a part of the education conducted with reference to the profession to be pursued. I have no controversy with that view. I think the idea should be impressed that different minds, different persons, in different situations, with different capacities and with reference to different professions, should pursue different courses of instruction. I do not believe we can bring all to the same mode of education precisely. I think the University of Michigan, in offering three or four courses of instruction, which are regarded equivalent to each other in the amount of cultivation, allowing students to vary their studies, according to their tastes and inclinations, and according to the professions they intend to follow, will result in the greatest good to the greatest number. For instance, there was established a scientific and a Latin course. Previous to that, there was a classical and scientific course; the scientific differing from the other, only in excluding the Greek and Latin, and embracing more of science and mathematics; and in substituting in part, for the Greek and Latin, French and German. Now a third course has been instituted, by adding Latin to the scientific, and deducting some of the mathematics; and it is intended to make each course equivalent to the other. I think this is particularly important, with reference to the professions.

It may be interesting to understand that in this country, so far as the requirements for medical study are concerned, no course of preliminary education is required, — none whatever. It is a most lamentable fact. The medical department of the University of Michigan, has remonstrated against this state of things; but their own requirements on the subject, have not been thoroughly enforced, for the reason that no other medical school requires anything but that the student should sign his name in the matriculation book, and pay his fees. This is lamentable, and explains the amount of quackery in the profession, and the want of professional training and culture.

The law schools are in the same condition precisely. They require nothing of the student but that he come and pay his fees. I think there is not a single exception. The law school in the University of Michigan, the largest in the country, does not require anything more. The question is, whether this Institute may not, by bringing a knowledge of these facts before the community, cause some improvement to be made in this respect.

We have endeavored to establish a high grade of preliminary education; but it has failed to a great extent. The standard has undoubtedly been raised by the agitation; but nothing, after all, is absolutely required. This has seemed to be a necessity; because, if there was not a sufficient number of men educated to practise in the professions, in the Western States, a large proportion of the men who would enter the profession and commence the practice, would do so without any preliminary education. Therefore medical schools have felt justified in admitting men without adequate preparation; or, at least, have felt excused, on the ground that, if not admitted, they would go into the practice of the profession, without any preparation. But the time has now

come, in the multiplication of grammar and high schools, which exist in the west even more abundantly than in New England, that there is no longer any excuse; and every young man, who aspires to a profession, must be required to make the necessary preparation to enter the professional school.

Mr. Philbrick. Is there, in the University of Michigan, any general course that all are required to pursue.

Dr. Palmer. Yes: there are certain studies which are required of all, throughout the course. There are three lists; and those, pursuing the studies of either one, recite together.

Mr. Hammond inquired of *Mr. Philbrick* why Greek should not be studied as a preparatory study, if Latin is to be studied.

Mr. Philbrick replied, that he did not intend to express any opposition to Greek; but only to raise the question, when it should come in, as a part of the education.

Rev. W. D. Wilson, acting president of Hobart College, New York, said, that which goes to make a man is necessary to be studied. If a person is to be a clergyman, lawyer, or physician, he must first be a man; whatever the profession, that is the first requisite. Manhood is the great thing; it is that which we shall carry through life and into eternity. There will be no physicians or lawyers there, as they do not pertain to humanity, as such. To develop manhood, two elements are required, one of which is strictly educational, and unfolds the faculties so that one is led to think for himself. The acquisition of the power of thinking must begin with the child, and be developed with the physical growth. What is studied is not a matter of so much consequence. The study of mathematics is one kind of culture; that of the languages, another; and that of the physical sciences, another. The Greek language is to be preferred to all

others, as a study, for its effect upon the mind and as a means of culture.

A man, in this country and age, needs to know a little of everything; and, when it is considered that preliminary study should be with reference to producing a man, instead of a machine, our course of education should be liberal, omitting nothing that may promote the mental power or culture of man.

EVENING SESSION.

The Institute met at eight o'clock. Mr. A. G. Boyden, of Bridgewater, offered resolutions of thanks to various railroad corporations, for favors granted to the Institute; to the lecturers, for their able and instructive addresses; to George T. Littlefield, for his faithful services as Secretary; to Mr. Burbank, for the free use of his hall; to Rev. Charles W. Spear, Principal of Maplewood Institute, and to Mr. L. Scott, Superintendent of Schools in Pittsfield, for the satisfactory arrangements made by them for the accommodation of the Institute.

The resolutions were unanimously adopted.

ADDRESSES.

Dr. Woolworth, Secretary of the Board of Regents, of New York, said, in response to a call for statements respecting the condition of education in New York:—As a delegate, Mr. President, to your body, from the University Convocation, of the State of New York, which has held its annual meeting the present week, I bear to you their cordial salutations and their best wishes for the success and prosperity of this Institute in future years, to the same or a higher extent than they have been enjoyed in the past. We have long

known the good work which the American Institute of Instruction has performed. We have always read its proceedings with interest, and have been impressed with what it has done.

We have, in the State of New York, an educational organization somewhat different from that in any other State. We have our common and public schools, which are constituted much on the same plan as those of New England. Those schools, we think, have advanced in character, in good work, and in reputation within a few years past, so that they are now really better than they have ever been.

We have recently established a system of free education, providing for the support of our public schools, by taxes upon the property of the State, the principle being, that the property of the State is bound to educate the children of the State.

In addition to these schools, we have a system of academies, numbering about two hundred, being brought into existence, by voluntary, private contributions, almost entirely, and having an amount invested in them, in buildings, libraries, and apparatus, of nearly three million dollars. Many of these academies, particularly in the larger villages and cities, are passing into public, free high schools.

Then we have our colleges; and these, with the academies, are under a general supervision of a Board, created by the Legislature, denominated the Regents of the University. To that Board they are subject for purposes of visitation, of supervision, and care. They have each their own local board of trustees, by whom the local affairs of the institutions are administered; and they report every year to the Regents of the University, who exercise over the institutions a sort of parental care. The University Convocation, which we represent here, is a body made up of the officers of these

colleges and academies. We have just closed a session of three days, at Albany. We have the same interest in the work of education which you have who have gathered here.

Our State embraces nearly four millions of people. We have about twelve thousand school districts, and nearly or quite twenty thousand teachers. Eight normal schools have been established within the last three years. The buildings have been erected for these schools by the local authorities of the places where they are established, at an expense of from seventy-five to one hundred thousand dollars each.

I confess I was a little surprised to hear the question of classical education discussed in Massachusetts. I thought that was settled here and that classical learning was regarded as indispensable to a liberal education. As Secretary of the Board of Regents, I have visited very extensively the academies of the State of New York, and I have uniformly found that, where there is a teacher who has zeal and interest in his work, he communicates that spirit to his children, and the study of the classics is pursued with success; and the influence of that kind of study in forming the mind and shaping the intellect, is positive and absolute. I believe that if a teacher is zealous and efficient, his pupils will become earnest and zealous and successful in the pursuit of their studies, whatever they may be.

I thank you for the attention which we, as representatives of the University Convocation, have received, and beg to assure you that you have our best wishes in regard to everything that concerns the cause of education in Massachusetts.

Rev. Mr. Spear, of the Maplewood Institute, Pittsfield, spoke of the pleasure he had received from attending this meeting of the Institute. He was gratified with the results of the meeting; but he had been somewhat surprised at the necessity for discussing certain questions, which he had sup-

posed were settled twenty years ago, among the teachers of the State. No teacher can pursue his work from year to year, with his eyes open, without finding some change or modification of his earlier views necessary, in accordance with the spirit of the times. He could have wished that the classical question had not been considered unsettled. He thought that languages should be commenced early, as the power of learning them seemed to be given by the Creator, for that special purpose, at an early age. Words, even if not fully understood at first, are the seeds of things, which will, in time, germinate and ripen and bear precious fruit.

He said he wished that the welcome of the town to the Institute had been more fully expressed by a general attendance; as he was sure the people would have enjoyed the meetings if they had come in. He had been profited by them, and was grateful that he had had an opportunity to attend them.

Mr. Camp, of New Haven, spoke of the state of education in Connecticut. He was ashamed to hail from a State which had decided, by its legislation, that no normal school was needed in it. He spoke of the interest in education in the city of New Haven more particularly, and of the buildings erected recently for school purposes, and of the measures taken to train their own teachers for their work.

J. W. Bulkley, Esq., of Brooklyn, N. Y., spoke of the effort commenced in that State, in 1844, to make the schools free schools, and of the work done in that direction until the object was gained in October last. He referred, with special pride, to the noble endowment of the Cornell University, and the ample appliances furnished for securing great results to the cause of education from that institution.

Dr. L. Van Bokkelen spoke of the schools in Maryland, where he was lately State Superintendent, and of several of

the other Southern States, which he had recently visited. He believed that Maryland took the lead in free public schools, in point of time. In the reconstructed condition of the States, every one recognizes the obligation upon the property of the State to educate all the children of the State. All the constitutions of those States require the establishment of a system of free public schools to be supported by general taxation. Seeing the people settling upon this basis, he believed that if reconstruction were allowed to go on, it would be of such a character as not to need reconstruction again, because there will be a solid basis of general intelligence, where all will be provided for, whatever their class, or previous condition. In Maryland, the act of emancipation was by a majority of the people; and the same constitution which emancipated the slaves, proclaimed the policy of general education, and imposed a State tax for the support of free public schools. Though the State has passed under Democratic control, there has been no backward step in relation to education. The schools of Maryland, as compared with those of New England, were far behind; but they are trying to approximate to them. The schools may now be kept open ten months in the year. For three years they have been kept open nine months each year; and the policy will be to keep them open ten. Books and stationery are provided for the poor, and any child, by paying fifty cents, can have the use of all necessary books.

Rev. John Todd, D.D., of Pittsfield, was then called up, and said:—Twenty-five years ago this Institute met here. It does not seem long to me; but perhaps there is no one here now, beside myself, who was here then. I met with them then, and rejoiced; and I have met with and rejoiced with you now.

You can hardly expect that I should sympathize with all the

changes that are going on in every department of life, but I do. There was a young Scotchman over here, who did me the honor to call on me, as he said he wanted to see a specimen of antiquity. He said he had always supposed that John Bunyan and John Todd were contemporaries. However, I do sympathize with all the improvements in every department of life. I have not got to the stage to be croaking, and saying that society is growing worse; I feel that every department is growing better. Your school-books are better; your schools are better; and everything pertaining to education is far in advance of what it was twenty-five years ago. No man now thinks of sending out his son, as I was educated; no man thinks of going forth into the world as I went forth; and my surprise is that I have been able to accomplish anything, or even maintain a standing. The advantage in books on teaching is as great as in any department, unless it be in the use of firearms; and I do not know but the human mind has expended every effort and every invention in that department.

That curious thing, the human mind, is not yet educated; but there are great advances still to be made. The great Dr. Johnson said he thought all that could be done, had been done in education. But what improvement there has been since his day! These things are to go on. You and I do not understand the human mind; but I think it is being understood better and better.

I heard something said here about grammar. I never studied it. I brought up seven children, and none of them studied English grammar. But they studied Latin and Greek, and they made out to pick up enough in English language to make their way. I do not believe the time will ever come when men can be thoroughly educated, without a thorough course of classical and mathematical study. I bow

to science; but I do not believe the human mind can be thoroughly disciplined, as it should be, without classical and mathematical study. It was said, that the Greeks possessed and used their polished language, before they had a grammar, or anything that looked like one. And yet how perfect the language! It was because they educated their boys and girls to speak properly, and make no violations of language in daily conversation.

When you open a book and read down a page, if there is a letter gone in any word, you notice it; because you spell every word as you read. I spell every word as I speak. Now, this wonderful machine, this quick, this indescribably quick instrument, is committed to you, to train and bring forth, in its perfection, — the human mind.

Let me say to these co-workers, that, as they are teachers, I am a teacher; and let me remind you that this work is the most noble, honorable, and glorious that can be committed to human beings; that in taking immortal minds, and training them, and bringing them up, you are the engines at the top of the hill, placed there to draw the whole community up as high as you are. The world will reverence and honor you more and more. You see this rich man and that, who plant institutions and give them their names, and endow them with two or three hundred thousand dollars; but, after all, the hard work has to be done by the teacher, and nothing but hard work can make any institution. And the man that works the hardest, in any department, is the one who will succeed, and in no other way. Labor, effort, is all that I know about genius; I do not believe there is any other.

One thing more. I wish these, my fellow-teachers, to understand that they are not to have their compensation in dollars and cents. You will find clerks in insurance offices, and in other places, receiving more money than you do. They

will drive fast horses, and live in high houses, and have better equipage. Your compensation is not to be in dollars and cents, nor is mine, nor that of any man who is laboring for humanity. God does not give our reward in that shape or form. Our reward is in loving the work, in doing good, and in feeling that we are elevating humanity. That will be better pay than silver and gold and greenbacks. You are laboring in God's plan of benevolence. You are laboring in a day when your labor is decisive of the destiny of this nation, and through it, the destiny of other nations. You do not know when and where you will raise up a great instrument for humanity, and you may not know it in this world; but, if you do not, you will see it from the heights above, and you will see that your works follow you, and you will know that your instructions go down to the future, and that the character which you communicate will be projected to another and another generation. Courage, then, in your labors and in your spheres, and feel that God is looking upon you with approbation, and that he who is doing the work of elevating the human mind and the immortal soul, is doing the work for which Jesus Christ died on the cross. (Applause.)

Col. Homer B. Sprague spoke also for Connecticut. He said he was a little proud of the State; and he thought that, during the last two or three months, a great deal had been done for the cause of education. They have swept the odious rate bill from the State, and now, for the first time, the schools are free. No person can now be denied admission to the schools, on account of race or color. Instead of appropriating \$960 a year, for teachers' institutes, \$3,000 were given this year. A resolution was carried through the legislature, that the normal school shall be re-opened, next June unless the next legislature reverses the action. He concluded by expressing his gratification at what Connecticut has recently done.

Prof. S. S. Greene was requested to speak for Rhode Island. He said there was little to be reported about Rhode Island, except that the people still hold on. John Randolph, long ago, called Rhode Island "a wart on the nose of the universe." Said Prof. Greene, We have not increased much; we still remain about the same as at that time. We have primary schools, grammar schools, and a college up on the hill. We are in earnest, and a goodly number of us have come up here, and we are improved by coming here. We have found the air of Berkshire all right. After paying an appropriate compliment to Rev. Mr. Spear, of Pittsfield, for the interest he had taken in this meeting, and for his efforts to make the occasion an agreeable one to as many as possible, he said there was no teacher, notwithstanding our battling of opinions, who would not go home prepared to go to work with more zeal and earnestness than heretofore. He counselled teachers to try to preserve the vigor and freshness, with which they would commence their duties, at the opening of the next term, by more exercise in open air, and by more interest in their work.

Mr. T. W. Valentine, of Brooklyn, N. Y., being called up, spoke briefly, expressing his pleasure at the results of the meeting. He had been greatly profited; and had been delighted with the opportunity to pass around the beautiful village, and especially to visit the rural cemetery, and stand by the graves of some of the illustrious dead.

Rev. Wm. D. Wilson, President of Hobart College, N. Y., spoke in congratulatory terms of the meeting, and eulogized the work in which the members of the Institute are engaged.

The Institute then united in singing the doxology, "Be Thou, O God, exalted high," &c., and at a quarter past ten o'clock, adjourned *sine die*.

LECTURE I.

THE CLASSICAL QUESTION.

BY W. C. COLLAR.

In democratic and republican communities, undoubtedly the general diffusion of education is an affair of great importance, since upon the intelligence of the masses depend the strength, justice, and security of government. But it is also true that, in such countries more than in others, the higher education, which must always and everywhere be the privilege of a select few, is vitally connected with the power and prosperity of a people. In our own land the absence of "ideals which suggest heights of grandeur, or intellect, or feeling, or refinement," leaves us without the strongest incitements to excellence, and, what is worse, begets a feeling of self-satisfaction which is a most serious hindrance to real progress. The only ideals possible for us are men of genius, or learning, or exalted character, — ideals the noblest, it is true, but rare in any land, and in our own lamentably too few. The only aristocracy to be desired by us is the aris-

toeracy of learning and refinement; but such is the levelling spirit of democracy, that we are impatient of a superiority that is not clear and indisputable.

As a natural consequence, probably in no country is high culture so little esteemed *per se* as in our own. Indeed it is sometimes rather a disadvantage to a man to be highly educated; for not seldom it is the self-educated, that is, the ill-educated or the uneducated man that is the popular favorite. Accordingly we are not surprised, when we find in a recent popular address in favor of utilitarian studies, that the young men of this country are dissuaded from the classics, on the ground that it is not by such pursuits that men acquire wealth, or rise to positions of influence and power; and that Andrew Johnson is therein pointed to as an illustrious example of one who has risen through every grade of office, from that of alderman in his native city to the presidency of the United States, without knowing a word of Latin or Greek. It would be unjust to assert that there is a general neglect of higher education among us; but certainly the fact that out of a population of 30,000,000, we have less than 13,000 matriculated students in our colleges, is one of no uncertain significance; nor can one who has observed the course of thought

in this respect doubt whither we have long been tending.

I cannot, then, share the belief, or indulge the expectation of many, that the opposition to classical studies, which has grown so vehement within a few years, is of recent origin, or that it will prove to be of transient duration. Few who have not examined the subject can be aware to what a degree classical study has declined in the public regard, and how considerably it has receded from its former place in schemes of liberal culture.

Less than a century ago, the almost exclusive business of the student at Yale and Harvard, during the first three years of the college course, was the reading of certain classic authors. Now Latin and Greek share this time with about twenty other studies; while at Harvard, they may be omitted altogether after the Freshman year. Indeed if we look closer, we find that of this first year, less than half the time of instruction, and so presumably of study is given to the ancient languages. This can but be regarded as an important concession to the clamor for "practical knowledge."

How early the hostility to classical studies became developed in the United States, I am unable to say; but nearly forty years ago it

had become so marked that the president of Harvard deemed it necessary to enter upon an elaborate defence of them, in a report to the Overseers. In England this movement has been less rapid; yet within a period of a little more than fifty years, Oxford has added to her curriculum mathematics, botany, chemistry, mineralogy, geology, political economy, Sanscrit, the modern languages of Europe, and modern history.

At most of the great English schools, — probably the most conservative institutions of their kind in the world — mathematics, modern history, modern languages, and something of natural science, have been added to the old classical course.

The controversy of which I speak, dates in Germany from about the end of the Thirty Years' War. At that period and indeed from the revival of learning till 1739, when the first *Realschule* was established, education was almost exclusively classical. Not till 1832 did the Prussian government concern itself about the *Realschulen*; and not till 1859 did it frame for them a definite plan and course of study. Yet despite this neglect of government, in 1863 the number of *Realschulen* (which answer in the main to our high schools) was nearly half as great as that of the Gymna-

sia — the classical schools — favored as the latter were by official supervision and support, and enjoying the great advantages of ancient origin, complete organization, thorough instruction, and of being the avenues to high public stations! Nor is this all. The Gymnasia no longer confine themselves to classical instruction, but include in their curriculum mathematics, German, French, physiology, natural history, writing, drawing, and religion. In fact, it appears by the *Lehrplan*, added by Matthew Arnold to his recent valuable report upon secondary education, that only sixteen out of thirty-eight hours a week are devoted to Greek and Latin.

This rapid growth of schools for modern studies, and increasing preference for the new learning, is more marked, as we should expect, in France than in Germany. In 1863, of the 66,000 boys in the schools of the former country under state supervision, 20,000 were pursuing a course of study of which Greek and Latin formed no part; and 40,000 in the private schools were receiving the same instruction. And yet non-liberal secondary education has, in France, been but a few years separately organized.

Such in brief are a few facts to which I deemed it proper to ask your attention. What do they establish? Most clearly that while

Latin and Greek were, less than a century, I might almost say less than half a century ago, universally considered about the only means and instrument of education, now they are reckoned but a single factor even of liberal culture. And it has been remarked by an English scholar, in a candid and able review of the controversy on classical education, that the inevitable progress of things is gradually but silently giving a preponderance to modern sciences.

These facts are sufficient to indicate how powerfully the current is setting against the study of the ancient languages among the most highly cultivated nations of the world. In fact, already the question seems to be with the French, not how much of the classical cargo can be saved, but how much can be safely thrown overboard.

Before dismissing this topic permit me to quote some words from the report to which I have already referred. Mr. Arnold says: "The set of the modern spirit is so decisively in favor of the new instruction, that whatever reasons may be given why it should not succeed, it will probably, in the end, succeed in some shape or other. This current of opinion is indeed on the continent so wide and strong as to be fast growing irresistible; and it is not the work of authority. Authority does all that can be done in favor of

the old classical training; ministers of state sing its praises. Still in the body of society there spreads a growing disbelief in Greek and Latin, at any rate, as at present taught; a growing disposition to make modern languages and modern science take their place. I remark this in Germany as well as in France; and in Germany too, as in France, the movement is in no wise due to the school authorities, but is rather in their despite, and against their advice and testimony."

If we inquire whence this movement comes, the answer is not difficult. Its origin must be sought primarily in the intensely practical tendencies of the times. "This age," says Carlyle, "we should not characterize as an heroic, devotional, philosophical, or moral age; but above all others as the mechanical age." And I will add that of all nations of this mechanical era we Americans are the most mechanical. Our national excellencies and those on which we especially pride ourselves, are all of the practical sort; and whatever does not conduce or seem to conduce to material interests is undervalued or contemned. This all-pervading, all-engrossing utilitarianism is striking at the root of all higher education among us; or rather, it is the worm gnawing unseen at the heart of the tree, destroy-

ing its vigor, its beauty, and its life. In one word, classical studies "don't pay," and therefore are in low repute. Doubtless many of our statesmen would be ready to say of the N. Y. Tribune what a celebrated orator of the House of Commons said of the London Times — that "one copy of that paper is worth more than the whole eight books of Thucydides."

Naturally under the influence of such ideas, many youths begin a course of classical study, not from any desire for culture as a good in itself, but as a necessary stepping-stone to a profession; work with but half a heart at what seems a useless drudgery; and when their college career is ended, throw aside their Latin and Greek, and deplore the time wasted in such unprofitable pursuits.

But it would be a partial view indeed to attribute the diminished regard for classical training solely to the materialistic tendencies of the age. Many other causes have doubtless contributed to this result. The wonderful development of the sciences within the last half century, the increased power man has thereby gained over natural forces, and the vastly improved physical condition of the most civilized nations have powerfully attracted men to studies which seem to promise such splendid results, and have cast into the shade those

whose aim is not immediate practical utility, but a complete and noble culture.

No doubt something also must be ascribed to the influence of specious objections to the study of the ancient languages,—objections often urged and seldom refuted. These I must pass by; for it is not my purpose to attempt a formal defence of classical education. All possible arguments in its support have been stated again and again; and I have no wish to do ill, what has already been done well. I will only remark that the objections to which I refer generally spring from a total misconception of the nature and aim of education — from assuming that that aim is the “informing” rather than the “forming” of the mind; the acquisition of knowledge, rather than the most perfect and harmonious development of all the powers of the intellect; in a word *facts* instead of *power and culture*.

Finally, whatever in classical instruction can be charged as unphilosophical, pedantic, or absurd, has not only been placed in the strongest light, but not unfrequently represented as the sum total of classical education. The chief occupation of the pupil is made to appear to be a lumbering the mind with words, laboriously committing to memory a thousand things which he cannot understand, and delivering himself with sighs, and

tears, and groans that cannot be numbered, of the lamest of Latin hexameters and Greek iambics. No system can stand if tried by its abuses alone; nor will it generally be admitted as a fair mode of argument to infer the worthlessness of a scheme of mental training from the mistakes or the prejudices of those who impart it. A sick man might as well denounce the whole science of medicine because he had had the misfortune to employ an ignorant physician; or a client declare the law a snare because an incompetent attorney had mismanaged his case.

I repeat that it is not my purpose to weigh the claims of the classics on the one hand against those of scientific or utilitarian studies on the other; but there are many reasons, of which I can pause to mention only two, why the study of ancient literature should be especially fostered in this country. To us the languages of the Greeks and Romans are the only memorials of the most gifted and powerful nations of the past. Our world is not the same as that which witnessed their rise and fall. We look up to a different sky, we tread a different soil, and to all but a favored few our isolation from the "visible tokens" of their genius and their greatness, from all the scenes of their wars and their triumphs is complete and final. Our modes of life and modes

of thought, our opinions, our affections, our surroundings, our civilization, are all different. To the European this is far otherwise. To him their statues, their arches, their theatres, their temples and their tombs, though lying in dreary ruins, cast down by the hand of time and by the still more ruthless hand of man, yet tell of their divine perception and love of beauty, their magnificence, their glory, their superstitions, and their fate. To him the very streams, the valleys, and the mountain passes recall their labors, their conflicts, their defeats, or their victories. He lives in the cities they founded or built; many of his rites and customs are inherited from them. To them he owes his language and his laws. The currents of ancient life flow down to him by a thousand channels. He is linked to the past by a thousand chains. All that art and nature, all that his civilization, his laws, and his language help him to realize of those wonderful peoples and of the life they lived, we must get from their writings, or not at all.

Again, energy, readiness, and courage are our most striking characteristics. We are boastful, impatient, and dogmatic. Moderation and simplicity are not the virtues we most admire. Yet they are the virtues that eminently distinguish the spirit of antiquity. It is not strange then

that we discover a remarkable want of affinity for studies that impress lessons so distasteful and impose habits so foreign. Yet this fact, so far from being a reason for abandoning them, seems to me an excellent reason why we should apply ourselves to them with care and diligence. For it is not the office of education to strengthen those faculties of the mind that are already strong, but to invigorate and develop those that are weak.

While therefore I would urge, with all iteration and emphasis, the absolute necessity of classical study for us Americans, it is not so much because "the writings of the ancients furnish almost faultless models in literature, the most graceful and some of the noblest poetry, the finest eloquence, and the wisest historical writing," as that the rational study of those tongues offers the most effectual means for correcting our worst faults of intellect, of taste, and of character. And for this reason, if for no other, it behooves every friend of culture not only to use his influence to prevent the further decline of these studies, but to maintain and illustrate their dignity and worth.

How shall this be done? Not surely by extravagantly asserting the unequalled fitness of the classics for all purposes of mental training. The opinions of wise men, the teachings of

nature and experience, reason and common sense, declare that they are not peculiarly adapted to the period of childhood; and it should be equally evident, one would think, that they are not the most profitable studies for all minds, or for all classes and conditions.

I have somewhere read that Cato the Censor was asked by a certain person what was the best mode of employing his capital. He said, "To farm good pasture land." What the next? "To farm middling pasture land." What next? "To farm bad pasture land." A writer, commenting upon this anecdote, says: "Similar notions seem to prevail respecting classical learning. Can a young man spare the time necessary for passing through college? Make him a good classical scholar. But a second will go into business when he leaves the school. Make him a tolerable classical scholar. A third has still less time for snatching up knowledge, and is destined for active employment while still a boy. Make him a bad classical scholar."

Nor again will the interests of classical education be promoted by denying the meagre results of classical instruction, to which its enemies triumphantly point, and which its candid friends must sincerely deplore. The harvest is indeed poor, but the reapers many. The more skilful

and industrious gather, with much toil and sweat, a few sheaves, thin and stunted; while the less diligent bear off only empty straw.

I pass to remark that it becomes us, as teachers in whose hands rests so largely the cause I advocate, to examine with care the method by which classical instruction has been imparted, and to reject, without reluctance or regret, whatever may appear unreasonable in principle, or false in practice. Certainly the length of time spent in acquiring some knowledge of two ancient languages may be admitted to raise a doubt whether the best possible course has been pursued. Poverty of results and the inordinate amount of time consumed upon the classics are the two fundamental objections to this kind of education. And if, as I have already intimated, the real question respecting the classics is, "How shall we prevent their being entirely cast aside?" the answer will be found, and the difficulty removed, by devising some method by which much more can be learned in much less time.

This is the problem pressing for solution. But before attempting to solve it, let us examine the two complaints which I have mentioned. First, that of time. Boys spend from two to six years in preparation for college, and four years in college, making from six to ten years; but of this

time probably not more than two thirds is appropriated to Latin and Greek. So that we may fairly say, that a period varying from four to seven years is devoted exclusively to acquiring two languages. Supposing the work of education to begin at seven and continue till twenty-two, we find that from one fourth to two fifths of the time is occupied on these languages. The mere statement seems a little startling, and may well challenge the gravest reflection.

The value of the acquisition may indeed be equal to the cost of precious years consumed, but it certainly ought not to be a matter of serious doubt. Of course it is difficult, if not impossible, to ascertain what the actual results of this long and elaborate training are; but two facts may be mentioned as indicating very clearly that they are not altogether such as to enkindle pride. I refer to the extreme rarity of distinguished classical scholars in this country, and to the fact that we are in truth as much dependent upon Germany for all original classical knowledge, as we are upon India or Brazil for diamonds. One thing is beyond dispute, and that is that the vast majority of our classically educated youth are unable to read with ease and pleasure a Greek or Latin author.

Prof. Thatcher remarked at a meeting of this

Association three years ago, at New Haven, that "if he thought the object were to learn Latin, and be a master of Latin, he would give up the present method of teaching, and pronounce it a failure. That object is not attained." That is, whatever else we may learn in studying Latin, we do not succeed in learning the Latin language. Mr. Ticknor, while professor in Harvard, doubted if one could, by the means offered him in this country, make himself a good Greek scholar, and questioned whether any actually learned to read Latin with intelligence and facility.

But the testimony of Dr. Barnard, president of Columbia College, is directly to the point. "For a period," says he, "varying from seven to ten years, we keep young men under a course of instruction in Latin and Greek, and at the end of that time they are unable, in any proper sense, to read either the one or the other. If there are any [of our graduates] who can read even such books of Latin or Greek as they have read before with anything like the fluency with which they read their mother-tongue, the number cannot be large; and if there are any who can read with similar facility classic works which they take up for the first time, the number is so small that I have never seen one."

In Scotland and in England, as is well known,

much more time is given to Latin and Greek than with us ; so that, though the method of instruction is nearly the same, and though their classically educated youth are often said to be "preternaturally ignorant" of everything but the classics, we might reasonably suppose a greater success would be achieved than is common with us. But it is admitted by Prof. Pillans of Edinburgh, that only a very small proportion of the classically instructed in Scotland, after spending five or six years, chiefly on Latin and Greek, get even a tolerable knowledge of those languages. From the report of commissioners appointed in 1862 by the British Parliament to examine certain public schools in England, I extract the following : —

"The standard of the matriculation examination varies at different colleges. At Christ Church a candidate is expected to construe a passage (which he has read before) of Virgil, and another of Homer ; to write a bit of Latin prose, and to answer simple grammatical questions. Easy as this examination is, about one third in 1862 failed to surmount the trial. Very few can construe with accuracy an author they profess to have read, while the answers to simple grammatical questions are very inaccurate." But this is of course before their classical education is completed. Up to this time they have spent only some five or six years

in acquiring the rudiments of two languages. How is it at the end of their university course? We find the answer in the testimony of Charles Neate, Fellow of Oriel College. "I do not hesitate to say that the great majority of those who take a degree in Oxford, after having spent ten or twelve years of their life in the almost exclusive study of Latin and Greek, are unable to construe off-hand the easiest passages in either language, if they have never seen them before."

Now the argument in favor of classical education, always insisted upon with the utmost emphasis, is the unequalled excellence of the literatures of Greece and Rome. Indeed it would seem as if no argument could be considered complete which omitted a glowing panegyric on the surpassing beauty of the Greek and Latin authors. The student possessing the key to such inestimable treasures is a thousand times rewarded for all his wearisome years of study, and may be pardoned if he looks with compassion on those who have it not. But what if he fails to gain this key? He has still some consolation. He may be sure that if he has studied with faithfulness and diligence, his time has not been entirely wasted. His way will have been smoothed to the acquisition of several modern languages. His attention will often have been arrested by points of resemblance

or difference between the classic tongues and his own, and thus a new insight gained into English. He may have caught some glimpses of ancient life, and learned something of ancient thought. But this is the merest beginning. If his further progress is barred by inability to read the works of Greek and Latin authors, the best fruits are beyond and will ever be beyond his reach. His education, in one respect, and that a fundamental one, must be accounted a failure. The literatures which should serve at once as the means and incentive to higher culture, which he ought to be able to possess and enjoy, are sealed to him, and might almost as well be non-existent. He ends where he commenced, with grammar and lexicon! He stops just where the highest influences of the classics begin to work most effectively. Nor is this the worst. Much that he has acquired, insensibly fades from his mind. Impressions are not renewed, and soon become obliterated; for a man will seldom return to the studies of his boyhood, and when he does, the recollections of painful toil which are apt to be associated with the fragments read in youth will soon repel him. "Byron never recovered from the distaste for Horace which he acquired while reluctantly construing his verses at Harrow." And it was not without reason that Milton would preserve the

most excellent works from the "profanation of elementary teaching," and substitute in their stead Cato and Columella for the rudiments of Latin.

It appears then that a student spends from four to seven years in this country, and at least twice as long a time in England on Latin and Greek, and at the end of that time they are still to him unknown tongues. It is also probably true that ninety-nine of every hundred who take a degree in either country—with the single exception of those who become classical teachers—know considerably less of those languages at any subsequent period than they do at their graduation. For, without the ability to read a classic author with some ease, what inducement, not of a professional nature, would be likely to carry one through the drudgery of hunting out words in a lexicon. If ambition or a desire for self-improvement stimulate one to some efforts at first, his slow and toilsome progress, and an humiliating sense of incapacity, usually combine to discourage and disgust him. His Homer and Plato remain upon the shelf, or, seeming there silently to beseech or rebuke him, are carried to the bookseller's. I repeat then that in an important sense the student leaves off where he began. His foot still rests on the first round of the ladder, and the chances are that he will never take another

step. What would be thought of a French scholar who could not read the easiest books in that language without thumbing a dictionary? And what would be the probable value of French literature to him?

Will it be said that the power to read the classics is not essential? Then I ask, what, in the name of reason, is essential? Is it mastery of English that is mainly sought? What means so effectual as the practice of translating? Is it mental discipline? Is more discipline to be got from reading a book of Virgil, or from learning what nouns form the ablative in *i*? If memory, attention, judgment, and taste are to be cultivated, I maintain that careful translation is the most natural and powerful agent.

If this is true, it follows that the sooner the learner can be exercised in this way, and the sooner he can acquire this power in some degree, the better. Such was evidently the opinion once; for I find that in the seventeenth century the ability to read Latin *at sight* was one of the principal requisites for admission to Harvard College. "When any scholar is able to read Tully or such like classical Latin author *ex tempore*, and make and speak true Latin in verse and prose *suo* (ut aiunt) *Marte*, and decline perfectly the paradigms of nouns and verbs in the Greek tongue, then may he be admitted to the college."

The object of classical study in these times is undoubtedly a broad and high one; the method by which that object is sought seems to me radically wrong. The ultimate aim is a knowledge of ancient thought and ancient life; the immediate purpose, an acquaintance with the ancient languages, as the source of that knowledge. Or to speak more definitely, what we first require is the ability to read a Latin or Greek author. Now let us see by what method of instruction we try to effect this object.

A boy is set to work on the grammar and is required to memorize the entire etymology including several hundred rules and exceptions in gender, formation, and inflection, before attempting to translate a sentence. Some of the words with which he is obliged to load his memory and which he must recite with great volubility, are, in their "naked English meaning," simply indecent, while of others a distinguished scholar says, "I have not met them in twenty-seven years of classical reading and instruction."

After etymology is thus mastered, syntax is taken up and treated in the same way. Six months or a year is spent in this delightful and improving manner, after which the learner is allowed to begin translation. His daily lesson will comprise only a few lines; but from the first,

nearly every word must be parsed, and rules, intelligible or unintelligible, must be repeated for gender, inflection, mode, tense, government, agreement, or dependence. The phenomena of the language of all sorts and degrees of difficulty are accounted for by glibly quoting rules, remarks, notes, and exceptions, from the grammar.

In general, no attempt is made to discriminate between such knowledge as a boy should possess at the outset of his course and such as is proper only for the mature scholar, — between the simplest and most essential rudiments and the slowly-gathered fruit of wide reading and thorough research.

Mrs. Stowe in characterizing the system pursued at the Boston Latin School thirty or forty years ago, when her brother, Henry Ward, was a pupil there, says: "The whole educational process consisted in one square, solid attempt to smite the Latin grammar into minds of all sorts and sizes." It is reasonable to suppose that a third of a century has wrought great improvement, but would not Mrs. Stowe's words fairly characterize the average classical instruction of the present time?

As our youth advances, his attention is directed in the main to the same points, and the method continues unchanged. The rules and exceptions

in prosody — more than five hundred in number in our most popular grammar, as I ascertained by actual count after several weeks of painful drudgery in committing them for recitation, *horresco referens* — are learned by a dead pull of memory before a verse of Latin poetry is read.

In college the instruction continues to be of the same kind though often inferior in quality, since it will often happen that a young man goes from a devoted and experienced teacher to a tutor who has just taken his degree, and who gives to the instruction of his class only so much time as he can conveniently spare from his legal or theological studies.

Little account is made of exact idiomatic translation, but much of the forms and relations of words. In particular, the doctrine of the subjunctive mode continues to be the terror of Freshmen and Sophomores, exhausts their energies and engrosses a large share of the time of recitation. To sum up this whole matter in a word, our classical instruction from the beginning to the end is, in its essential form and spirit, a grammatical drill. Assuming, contrary to reason and experience, that a mastery of grammar is an indispensable prerequisite to reading and that facility in translating will be proportionate to the extent and profundity of grammatical knowledge, we fatigue

ourselves by beating an endless round of dreary technicalities and cheat ourselves into the belief that we are marching, when we are only marking time.

It thus appears that we curiously invert the natural order in learning. We pass from the abstract to the concrete, from rules to examples. We learn the language from the grammar, instead of learning the grammar from the language. And we make reading a secondary and remote, instead of a primary and immediate object. If it be asked what method I propose to substitute, I answer :

First, we must cease to look upon grammar as both means and end. We must not study a Latin author for the purpose of finding illustrations of grammatical precepts ; but we must read a Latin author first to learn the Latin language calling in grammar then, and then only, when it will afford real aid. I would require a boy's attention to be actively exercised from the first, and when a number of instances of any construction have been met with in reading and noted, I would have him frame a rule, or read it from his grammar. That is, let rules be established by induction and let them be used, not as a preparation, or a guide, but to fix what has already been learned by observation and comparison.

Secondly, I would omit the greater part of prosody, which requires one or two months of irksome study, and trust for a knowledge of quantity to the pupil's scanning, and repeating from memory many choice passages of poetry. Indeed there would be no difficulty in this respect if our system of pronunciation were not arbitrary and absurd, so that when the quantity of syllables is systematically studied much must be unlearned which habit has fixed. For example, we pronounce the short *a* of *pāter* as if it were long, and the long *i* of *filius* as if it were short. We say *vēnio*, *vēnis*, *vēnit*, and *vēneram*, *vēneras*, *vēnerat*, and subsequently learn that we ought exactly to reverse this pronunciation, — to say, *vēnio*, *vēnis*, *vēnit*; but *vēneram*, *vēneras*, *vēnerat*.

Thirdly, I would greatly increase the amount read in school and in the first part of the college course. On this point it will be most convenient for me to speak later. For the present, I wish to ascertain how much is actually read by a student who completes the classical curriculum in our best schools and colleges.

The requirements for admission to Harvard College are as follows : —

Latin prose	286 pages.
" poetry	400 "
Greek prose	212 "
" poetry	45 "
In all	<hr/> 943

The class of 1863 in Harvard read of —

Latin prose	238 pages.
" poetry	236 "
Greek prose	407 "
" poetry	202 "
In all	<hr/> 1,083

Taking this as the average amount now read in the college course by successive classes we have a sum total of 2,026 pages of Latin and Greek, which a Harvard graduate may be supposed to have read from the beginning of his preparatory course till he receives his degree. Two thousand pages would make four duodecimos of average size. Surprisingly small as this seems for the result of eight or ten years of classical study, it is probably nearly double what graduates of most other colleges read. In confirmation of this, I will only remark (without troubling you with further statistics) that in Amherst College a class recently graduated read a trifle less than three fifths, and a class at Yale a trifle more than three

fifths as much as the class of '63 at Harvard. What has been said respecting the inability of the classically educated in this country to read Greek and Latin books with intelligence and pleasure is thus in part explained, and the reason for suggesting that the amount read be largely increased becomes apparent.

To acquire the power of reading a modern language, as the French, with perfect facility, one must go over eight or ten volumes of prose and as many more of poetry. But we imagine, or seem to imagine, that the power to read languages at least five times as hard can be gained by one fifth as much. And this is not the worst. Even the little that we do read is read so slowly that half the benefit is lost. Who would think of learning German or Italian by reading half a volume a year? But in Latin and Greek our pace is considerably slower than this. *We read four volumes in ten years.*

But here a difficulty arises. "How," it may be asked, "is this proposition, largely to increase the amount of reading, consistent with the necessity which has been strongly insisted upon of reducing the time spent on Greek and Latin?" I think I may fairly assume that the method indicated for the treatment of the grammar will work some saving of time. Let us see whether a still

further saving of time can be effected. The first difficulty which confronts the tyro in Latin, when he attempts to translate, is his ignorance of the meanings of words. Almost every word must be looked out in a lexicon, where the ingenuous youth is gravely instructed to select from a host of definitions the one suited to his passage by "consideration of the context." Of course he is in a maze of difficulties, with no clue to guide him. He gropes in thick darkness, catching it may be a ray of light here and there, but mostly stumbling along in hopeless and futile bewilderment. Take, for example, the very first sentence of Nepos. It contains forty-seven words, and the main verb is in the sixth line after a colon. How many boys under fifteen probably ever succeeded in making out the sense without assistance? For a considerable time, if a boy extracts any meaning at all from his passage, it is rather more likely to be wrong than right; so that, added to his waste of time and trials of patience and temper there is the vexation and disappointment of failure at last. Besides, it should be remarked that his own blunders are far more likely to stick in his memory than the corrections of his master, while the latter is obliged to consume the time that should have been employed in giving instructions in the unprofitable task of

correcting mistakes. "In old times," says Long, "the teacher taught; now it is the common practice to let boys learn wrong that they may be set right."

Fourthly, then, to meet this difficulty I propose that the master should translate and explain fully each lesson before the pupil is set to study it. The latter may afterwards be required to reproduce his master's translation and remarks, so far as is desirable, and in particular he should be trained to observe and mark whatever seems to him new, difficult, or peculiar. Dictionaries I would proscribe, until the pupil has a tolerably extensive vocabulary at his command, and some acquaintance with the idiom of the language. An incidental advantage of no small importance will naturally result. A boy without a vocabulary or lexicon to turn to whenever he cannot at once recall the meaning of a word will soon learn the necessity of a close attention to the instruction of his master, and will be compelled to exercise the memory more constantly and more vigorously. It will be remembered that this was a cardinal principle of the instruction of the Druids; and I shall show presently that this, so far from being any new theory, was at a very early period a common practice.

In this way I am sure a boy may be carried over

two or three volumes with repeated reviews, in less than half the time usually consumed. And this is not the only gain. He has had nothing to unlearn, and therefore has been constantly stimulated to renewed exertions, since he has found that every effort tells. The more frequent recurrence of words in the same or in different senses has impressed them upon his memory, so that further progress must be considerably facilitated. Greater practice in translating has afforded the best means for improvement in his own language. And finally, as nothing has appeared too hard for his strength, a sense of power will have been gained which will aid him to grapple with difficulties to come. *Possunt quia posse videntur.* "Pleasure and acquisition will go hand in hand," and the saying of Johnson, "No child loves the man who teaches him Latin," will be no longer true.

That by this course the way will be somewhat smoothed, will, I know, be no recommendation in the eyes of some. But the days of asceticism (if I may so use the word) in education, as in religion, are past. In common with many others I believe the process of early education should be a pleasant, and not a painful one; and that our success in teaching will in no small measure depend upon our ability to make each successive

step easy and agreeable to the child. Permit me to quote a few words from Locke.

"In science, where reason is to be exercised, I will not deny but this method may be varied, and difficulties proposed on purpose to excite industry and accustom the mind to employ its own strength and sagacity in reasoning. But yet I guess this is not to be done to children whilst very young, *nor at their entrance upon any sort of knowledge*; then everything of itself is difficult, and *the great use and skill of a teacher is to make all as easy as he can*; but particularly in learning of languages there is least occasion for opposing children."

I have said that I advocate no new theory. The method proposed was practised in the sixteenth century by Sturm, one of the most successful schoolmasters that ever lived. From him it was adopted by Ascham, and also embodied by the Jesuits in their educational system, which Bacon admired and praised. It was the essential feature of Ratich's scheme, and, as modified by Ascham, pronounced by Dr. Johnson to be the best advice ever given for learning languages. It appeared again only under another form in the Hamiltonian method which in principle is now very generally applied in the learning of modern tongues. But before Sturm and Ascham we hear Dean Colet, who founded St. Paul's school, giving this

advice: "Wherefore, well-beloved masters and teachers of grammar, after the parts of speech are sufficiently known in our schools, *read and expound plainly* unto your scholars good authors. And show to them every word and in every sentence what they shall note and observe, warning them busily to follow and to do like, both in writing and in speaking; and be to them your own self also, speaking to them the pure Latin very present, *and leave the rules.*"

After the scholar has gained sufficient knowledge, he should be required to make out the lesson himself in presence of his teacher, receiving a little help as he meets with a new word or phrase. Next the pupil may be left to translate the lesson for himself with the aid of a lexicon. He will need to look out many words, after a little familiarity with the style of his author, and with the training he has had, will be pretty sure to give his passage a thorough trial before resorting to his lexicon. Finally, as soon as the pupil can follow easily, his progress may be further promoted by his teacher's translating with only occasional comments on the most difficult parts several pages at a sitting, in works not included in the regular business of the school, but lying parallel to the school curriculum.

If it be objected that such a method imposes

additional labor upon the teacher, I admit it. Indeed, I intended to propose that the teacher actually instruct his class, instead of confining himself to the duty of finding out whether his boys have probably studied the lesson assigned them. It will also evidently be necessary for him to know the lesson which he undertakes to teach. And if, as his scholars advance, he trains them to exact, elegant and fluent translation, I can assure him from experience that it will not be easy to satisfy them with his own performance.

If, on the other hand, it be said that no difficulties are left for the learner, I might ask in the words of Sydney Smith: "Where will the love of difficulty end? Can aversion be the parent of memory, impediment of perfection? Would it not be better if the difficulties of language were doubled, and thirty years given to languages instead of fifteen?" If the difficulty of acquiring knowledge by any particular method enhances the value of that method, then I admit that the present plan of learning Latin and Greek ought not to be changed; for it is impossible to conceive of another that could have an equally strong recommendation.

My argument is now completed; and it only remains for me to ask your indulgence a moment longer, while I recall the main points that have been presented.

It has been shown by a brief and cursory survey of the higher education in Europe and in this country, that classical studies are rapidly declining in public favor, and that this decline is due, in the main, to these three causes:—to the surprising development of science within the last half-century; to the activity and prevalence of the utilitarian spirit; and to the excessive duration and meagre results of the study of the ancient languages.

Our concern is with the last of these. In other words, the problem which the friends of liberal education have to solve if they would have the classics is, How can a better discipline and culture be gained with a material shortening of the period of study? As a possible help to a solution, the outline of a method of instruction has been sketched, based upon two principles.

First, that translation and not the mastery of technical grammar be made the primary object, and that the minute and exhaustive analysis of language be deferred till late in the course of study.

Second, that the principles of grammar should be gathered by careful observation in reading.

More on this point I need not repeat; but perhaps I ought to add that no suggestion has been offered as the fruit of idle speculation, but of se-

vere reflection, tested likewise in some measure by experience.

Two reasons were briefly stated why classical education should be heartily supported in this country; but while assuming that the study of Latin and Greek should hold a prominent place in any wide scheme of liberal culture, I have not sought to weigh their claims against science. Conscious of my inability, I have also had no wish to undertake the formal defence of the classics. *Non tali auxilio nec defensoribus istis, tempus eget.*

I could only hurl an ineffectual spear. But champions will not be wanting, so long as the love of truth remains; so long as the sordid impulse of self-interest is not the chief incentive to education; so long as a high and harmonious culture is felt to be something divine, and men contemplate with wonder and reverence the beauty, the genius, and the power of the past.

LECTURE II.

THE MEANS AND MANNER OF POPULAR EDUCATION.

BY JOHN BASCOM.

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—

EDUCATION ought not to be without a complete and a correct theory. Whatever excuses other processes may present for groping in the dark, this process of imparting knowledge, of saying in the intellectual world, Let there be light, has no apology for a method permanently deficient or false. This pressure for a perfect form, an unexceptionable method, of education, has been increasingly felt; and the passing years are full of valuable discussions on this point. As a result, education is assuming a completeness and symmetry hitherto unknown. Physical unites itself to mental training; the proscriptive studies of the past give ground to modern science, and thus, around each form of culture, there cluster the complementary branches of knowledge; as the turrets and towers of some grand cathedral stand grouped in a sisterhood of beauty and strength.

Indeed, to complete the parts, to perfect the symmetry and proportion of that *actual, practical structure* of truth which is reared in the education and discipline of the *common mind*, of that plebeian edifice which is built by the wayside, of stones gathered from every field; to make of this a building serviceable and beautiful, with the stubborn endurance of a market, the purity of a home, the sanctity of a temple, is the great, the crowning, labor of our time. To contribute something to the wisest and most effective method of public education, is our pleasure and labor. I need, then, no apology for presenting the familiar subject of The Means and Manner of Popular Education.

Means are to be judged by the ends in view, and we have learned to recognize *power* as the true end of education; faculties that can each and all perform easily, accurately, pleasurably, the offices assigned them. We are probably ready, in a degree in which man has never before been ready, to study the original ground-plan of human character, and conform all our labors to it; to expect the highest results from the relation of parts therein indicated; and, working on the capabilities of our complex nature, to train all into the possession of the power that belongs to them. The ideas which now occupy the mind of the edu-

cator are soundness, wholeness, health, symmetry, strength; the ideal which hovers in his imagination is one with full, proportionate powers, not marvellous in possessing any one thing, but in lacking nothing; with little it may be of the dash and brilliancy of genius, but with much of the efficiency and perseverance of talent; poorly fitted perchance to enter and delight the close-drawn circle of the highly endowed, but well fitted to head the masses, and lead them to that millennium of physical and spiritual food, which is peculiarly theirs, and from which they have been so long and so scornfully kept back.

But while power, general power, average and standard power, is the primary object of education, there is a secondary end, that of acquisition, which is necessary to it, and is easily and frequently substituted for it. Between intellectual possessions and intellectual power the relation is plain and simple. These possessions are essential sources of that power, and valuable only so far as they minister to it. A rich soil is a good preparation for a sturdy tree, and has its value in that fact only. If it ministers, and so far as it ministers, to growth, its richness is a condition to success as essential as the presence and health of the tree itself. Nevertheless it is the use and growth of the tree, which make the fertility necessary, and set

its limits. A soil rank and fetid with decay may fester and corrupt the life it was intended to nourish.

Thus mere knowledge, a memoriter acquisition of valuable facts, finds its service in its ministrations to thought, in putting more and better resources at the disposal of the mind. When it fails to do this, when it makes the mind a pack-mule of endless patience and stolidity, its real value disappears, and the learned imbecile congratulates himself on the shadow of a good whose substance he has lost.

Power, then, is plainly ultimate, and information possesses importance so far, and only so far, as it leads to it. Provide for growth, and the nutriment requisite for growth; and the more these processes can go on together, the more activity can provoke the appetite, and the appetite give occasion to activity, the better.

The end, therefore, of education, which we are to recognize in a discussion of its means and methods, is well-furnished, ready, round-about power, by which the man himself becomes possessed of the largest, most succulent, most fruitful manhood.

First among the means of education, in its more strict and ordinary meaning, are the studies to be pursued. Is there an exact order and an

exact proportion among these studies, by which perfect symmetry of intellectual powers is obtained on the one hand, and on the other the precise line of their development conformed to? We answer, No. While living processes are very delicate, they nevertheless admit of more chance and random dealing than do mechanical processes. Witness the hurry-skurry way in which the world is watered, and its tender buds fed on sunshine; the rough exposure into which its animal young are littered; and the surprising way in which human life sometimes thrives under the very feet of men. There are various orders in which a man can arrange his dinners, and no one of them is absolutely essential.

Yet, on the other hand, order is by no means a matter of indifference. One branch sustains another; and to hit, in that general way which the pliant wants of life allow, on the right sequence of studies, is not very difficult. If a co-ordinate branch comes a little earlier or a little later, the mind so easily accommodates itself to these minor changes as hardly to give ground for a decided choice between them.

The proportion which studies should bear to one another is more important. No great department of knowledge can be left unrepresented, or inadequately represented, without decided loss;

yet the influences which tend to this result are many and active.

Sometimes a branch of knowledge acquires a prescriptive right; holds by possession a position which does not belong to it. This has been, though it is fast ceasing to be, the case with the classical languages. There has belonged to them justly, historically, the largest share in education. The chief means of culture, the chief sources of knowledge, the storehouses of the past and of the present, — they were, for a long period, the first and the permanent condition of education. They now stand in no such relation to knowledge. Instead of covering the entire field, they have slowly and silently withdrawn to the one department of linguistic training. It is not strange that the historic, economic, and natural sciences, in elbowing their way forward, should jostle somewhat rudely these hoar instructors of the past. To yield something, to yield much, when the comparison is with former years, the classics undoubtedly ought. They no longer hold, in a general way, the keys of all knowledge. The danger, however, is, that it shall be forgotten how much is forever and inalienably theirs. They are and must remain the very centre and heart of linguistic training; they are structurally so and historically so. Now language is the most essen-

tial and peculiar instrument of man. To have and handle this in high perfection is at once cause and effect, condition and result, seed and fruit, in education. I care not how high a value you attach to natural history; a knowledge of no one of its objects can outrank a knowledge of man, who is the chief of those objects; and the mind of man, the history of man, the intellectual resources and growth of man, can only be known in connection with a critical study of language, the sensible and visible form of the invisible powers at work in him.

There belongs, then, to language, in its immediate, instrumental value, as that which makes facile and effective all our other knowledge, in its theoretical value as most intimate to man, and affording one of the fullest reflections of his character, a high, an independent position which can never rightfully be taken from it. The relative loss of powers which the classical languages have suffered should not be allowed to overshadow them in a symmetrical education.

Another force which tends to destroy the balance of education is the predominant movement of the age to which it belongs. None, I think, can doubt that the predominant tendency and power of this generation lie in the direction of physical inquiries. In these fields are found

the most active, courageous, patient pioneers of knowledge. The scientific world is in pursuit, — in excited, if not mad pursuit, — of bugs, birds, reptiles, comets, and the *et cetera* of this universe grouped in the comprehensive word *phenomena* — the things that do appear. Things unseen stand a poor chance. The permanent is forgotten in the excitement of the transient, the transpiring; and events, from the flash of a firefly to a geological convulsion, from the pustule on the skin to the eruptive outbreak of a great nation, occupy the mind.

As a result of this truly wonderful activity and interest in natural science, education is ready to be swayed unduly in that direction. The conflict goes on between the old methods and the new. The balance and harmony of repose escapes us. One institution gives itself unreservedly to the new; another clings tenaciously to the old. The one becomes a zoölogical garden, and the other remains a cloister. This wide-awake, bold, obtrusive, and most instructive spirit of physical inquiry is likely to acquire not only what so justly belongs to it, but much more. Education is different from inquiry. It does not begin with the nineteenth century; it is neither old nor new. It is neither physical nor spiritual; it is both. The roots of development hidden in the history of the past are as

valuable to it as the showy flowers of to-day; the invisible thoughts and hopes of man, as this outside world and proud framework of things.

A third force by which the harmony of education is endangered is the neglect and prejudices which may characterize a time or nation. As there are certain directions in which inquiry sets in a broad and strong current, so there are almost necessarily others from which it is withdrawn. These branches of knowledge suffer neglect, are underestimated, and fall away from the rank which belongs to them. In this position, at the present time, is intellectual philosophy, philosophy properly so called. I make this affirmation with more feeling, and more conviction of its truth, than any previous assertion; yet I expect that it will be thought peculiarly problematical and doubtful. Are not intellectual and ethical philosophy taught everywhere? Are not many confident opinions broached concerning them? Indeed, considering the uncertainty and diversity of the views expressed in them, do they not receive too much rather than too little attention? Such is the prevalent feeling concerning these highest branches of knowledge; and the form of its expression goes far to justify the statement that philosophy, both in investigation and education, is sinking, with us, from its true rank.

There are very few either eminent teachers or writers in America on these final themes of thought. The intellectual industry and ability of the land are chiefly directed elsewhere. The learned sentiment of the world is almost wholly reversed concerning metaphysical inquiries. Once they were thought to present themes of chief, nay, of almost exclusive interest. Now, they are not merely neglected, but every tyro of science signalizes his desertion by casting a stone at them. Metaphysics are regarded by many, and that, too, by those who, in their own departments, are leading minds, as a realm set apart to theories, fancies, unserviceable conjectures; the paradise of the dreamy, the agile, and the lazy, who have either not the industry or the sober purpose which would lead them to do a useful labor in inquiring into and classifying the facts of the world. Such persons stand afar off from this region,—are waiting to see it burned over, its present structures disappear in smoke, and the ground either left vacant, or occupied with more substantial edifices.

This contempt for what has been done is accompanied in a few with an astonishing conceit of what they and others, by a new method, will be able shortly to accomplish. Having knocked metaphysicians contemptuously about the head with the

flat of their swords, and driven them utterly forth, as they fancy, from the fields of science, they at once fall back on squatter sovereignty, introduce freely physical laws and notions, and propose to occupy this whole kingdom of mind as a mere outpost of that of matter.

Draper, among Americans, is a fair type of this class of scholars. He leaps the gulf between matter and mind without stopping to bridge it, or rather, I should say, without being conscious of its existence. Annexation is as natural and inevitable to him as, in years past and passing, it has been to Anglo-Saxon destiny. And, unless more haste is made, there will not be left a scrap of territory on which the manhood of man can stand; all conquering matter will have devoured the inquirer himself, and we shall go back to the dust from which we came up. Eternal and immutable laws seem to Mr. Draper every way more intelligible than eternal and facile liberty. The more dead and impersonal a thing or theory is, the more it commends itself to his favor and belief. The more alien to man, the more integral to matter, the more inspiring and probable is it.

In two most important respects is a leading branch of study unfairly treated, revealing a settled tendency of the times to overshadow and neglect it. Its inquiries and labors are spoken

of as necessarily uncertain and unprofitable; and its own appropriate methods, ideas, and forms of reasoning are pushed aside by those derived from a foreign, a physical field, wholly alien to the matter in hand, and sure greatly to mar it, or entirely to exclude it.

What is there to oppose to this very general and very decided tendency of the public mind? Only a few scattered and unsustained efforts here and there. Were it not for the religious interests involved, metaphysics would lose almost wholly their real character, or suffer entire neglect. Indeed, these religious interests carry on a very blind and unsafe warfare, self-destructive in what they yield, and illogical in what they retain, simply because the whole ground has not been carefully and wisely gone over. The inroads of physical science are only repelled when they become unbearable, when they pass certain prescriptive bounds; while the parties to the discussion fail to understand the true limits of inquiry, where and how far they are strong, where and how far weak.

It is a claim, therefore, which I would earnestly press, and all the more earnestly, because it is scarcely regarded as a claim, that philosophy, as a field of inquiry and a means of education, should resume something of its old rank. It is

an entire hemisphere in the sphere of knowledge. It furnishes new, independent starting points, a distinct class of phenomena, new forms of reasoning. It sets liberty over against causation; it opposes duty to fate, and weighs down the finite with the infinite. It enthrones man above matter, and holds back with bit and bridle from his sacred seats of authority that animal life, which *itself* awed into obedience and silence, some would, nevertheless, herd on, till it rushes with defiling hoof into the very precincts of spiritual manhood.

Let not man creep under, and crush himself under, that world of scientific knowledge which he proposes to carry. Better to know less and be more, than to know more and be less; but better far than either, from the true height of a just metaphysics, to look down on those kingdoms of nature that God has spread beneath our feet. To philosophy, the realm of spirit, the home of liberty, yielding a future to our aspirations and a promise to our hopes, let us retreat from the fixed laws of a physical world, that, like the waves of a rising tide dash coldly in upon us. Let me not flee, like some antediluvian, to a tree-top, from the on-coming floods of materialistic speculations; but rather, on the serene wing of a spiritual life, look scornfully down upon them.

Above all things would we strive to maintain the catholicity of education in this, its stronghold of personal liberty and individual power. There are other ways in which the symmetry of development is lost, but we pass on to the manner of education.

The most observable recent change in the manner of imparting instruction is that which finds most distinct and complete expression in object-teaching. This is another step from the abstract to the concrete, from the mental to the physical, from the pure region of thought to the mixed field of observation. I accept this as a great improvement in many respects, as giving a living form to ideas yet dry and dead to the mind; as calling forth and disciplining the senses, and uniting their activity with that of thought; and above all, perhaps, as giving an occasion and ground for the rule, the principle, the theory, in the facts which they explain. We are not given first the formulæ of knowledge, and left to discover, if perchance we are so fortunate, that there are certain things to which they apply. A *necessity* of knowing it sprung upon the mind by a few apt questions, a few skilfully directed observations, and then, in *gratification* of this want, the needed knowledge is given. While this method thus tends to clearness, increased interest, and

ease, and has a sufficient foundation in true philosophy, it yet requires its compensations and safeguards.

It is open to these dangers : Too great ease, and an aspect, an habit of mind, too objective, too materialistic. There is no gain in throwing the entire labor of thought, philosophy, penetration on the teacher, in providing a graded road up the ascents of knowledge on which the most heedless need not stumble. All that the pupil *can* do, he should be made to do, by way of reflection and interpretaions. An even flight of stairs soon becomes tiresome. The mind has most enthusiasm, is best pleased, when its powers are at once taxed and rewarded. The sense of successful exertion is the most gratifying. The method, therefore, under discussion should be rather the occasional and initiatory one than the habitual one. To teach the pupil to do his own work is the office of the instructor ; and aid, therefore, should be withdrawn as rapidly as it can be. The roughest and most difficult path of ascent is the most direct, and to this the aspirant should be put as soon as his muscle is sufficient for it.

The second danger is akin to the first : If it is disastrous not to see the applications of knowledge, it is hardly less so not to be sufficiently impressed with its scope and abstract character. To

consider arithmetically actual quantities, practical problems, is one form of discipline; but to contemplate algebraically general formulæ, abstract, representative signs, skeletons which exhibit the numerical relations of a whole class of problems, this is a not less valuable form of training. While, therefore, we are content, as in object-teaching, to start with the outside, we would be careful to keep the path of return open to the inner, the abstract, the symbolical, the truly significant, realm of pure thought. Here we fly; elsewhere we only walk.

A second kindred change of method in instruction, yet one that dates much farther back than this of object-teaching, is the more practical form that is given to knowledge, the closer relations in which it is brought home to the life and daily wants of the pupil. In one field this tendency remains to be completed, and the delay has brought undeserved discredit on the department. I refer to metaphysics. This, by its intimate relations to religion, to ethics, to social science, has as urgent, practical bearings as any science whatever. There is no interest in the ordering of individual life, in the structure of the family, in the connections of society, in the hopes of the future, that does not receive light, often its entire light, from philosophy. These practical issues of

profound, speculative thought have been so little dwelt on, that they are forgotten, and this immaterial realm has come to be regarded as a quagmire in which men flounder, as likely to issue on one shore as another, and more likely to find no shore. Metaphysics with us are taught more inadequately than any other branch whatever. Their theoretical scope is so little understood, their practical bearings so feebly pointed out, that one may pass through the curriculum of a college course with very little knowledge of the leading obligations that spring from his own constitution, with no preparation for the superlative, delicate, unexplored duties of the husband and father, and with only a little incidental light cast here and there on his obligations as a citizen. As a Christian, it more frequently happens to him than otherwise, that the articles of his faith and the principles of his philosophy are in conflict, complete or partial; and that he holds them both, scarcely cognizant of the opposition, and experiencing its evils without either knowing the disease or the remedy. So fundamental is this difficulty, so slow has been the movement by which philosophy is to assert and maintain its practical value, that much research is demanded before it can be rightly taught, and adequately supported by a development of the broad bearing of its principles.

We shall refer but to one more point which pertains to the method of education,—that of the stimulus, the outside pressure brought to bear upon students. To the surprise of a thoughtful mind, it is found more difficult to beget enthusiasm in advanced scholars, in those in the later stages of education, in college students, than in children, in those who attend on our high schools and academies. This would seem to indicate something wrong in our method. A healthy movement in knowledge should, of itself, beget momentum, inspire increased interest, and be carried on with the glow of accumulating life. The reverse of this seems to be true. Nowhere are students more undemonstrative in the interest felt, more inert, more reluctant to accept new labor, more tyrannized over by an hereditary, chronic, indolent, and querulous spirit than in college. Honors and prizes are multiplied to stimulate them; yet these act only on a few of the more advanced scholars, and leave the bulk of a class nearly unaffected. Artful, and more or less mischievous, methods are devised to arouse emulation and pride in these young men, and yet with only partial success.

I am inclined to believe, that one element of the difficulty is found in that which distinguishes these institutions from our high schools,—the ab-

sence of young women, and the consequent want of that natural stimulus which the more varied contact and motives of a high school afford. The young lady is quicker, more enthusiastic, more intuitive in her mental action. She imparts a certain brilliancy and life to the recitation room. She shames the dull indifference of the careless, phlegmatic male mind. Her lively memory and imagination and perceptions would enter like yeast into the heavy, torpid mass which composes the middle and lower half of a college class, arouse these sluggish young men to a better use of their powers, and cause a little light to find its way into their opacity. Intellectually, as well as socially, young men and young women are the complements of each other; and, divorced in their training, the one class runs to froth, and the other to sediment. In no place am I more habitually overcome with a sense of unrequited labor than in the presence of a college class. Restore again the relation between the sexes which God has ordained, for which he has made them; and the quick intuition and eager enthusiasm on the one side would blend with the profound reflection and patient purpose on the other; and we should build society up in that equal, living, organic contact of its intellectual elements, most favorable to its perfect life. Delicate, indeed, are the processes

of education ; but in proportion as we keep close to nature, dare to give her forces play, surround her only with those safeguards which protect, without restricting, her, shall we prosper. Success is more a matter of discovery than invention ; of submission than of policy. It grows up for us out of the earth ; it comes down to us out of the heavens ; it springs in our path from the interlock, under living and divine law, of those manifold elements whereof God frames a creation — and more, a creation in his own image.

As the discussion has been somewhat discursive, suffer me to gather up and knit together its leading points. Power, the mastery of one's faculties, is the chief object of education. Knowledge, the acquisition of facts, furnishes both the occasion that calls forth, and the nutriment that maintains, this activity of the intellectual forces. The order of study, though not a matter of indifference, admits the freedom and variety of conditions which belong to a living process. More important is that choice of studies which, each calling forth its own set of faculties, shall give fulness and symmetry to the intellectual life, leaving no important part of it to be overshadowed or altogether to fall away. The influences tending at this point to one-sided results are strong and various. To a few of them we have drawn atten-

tion. The first of these is the prescriptive hold which certain studies are liable to secure in the regular courses of training; the second, the bias, with us, the materialistic bias, of the age, establishing a current which it is difficult to resist; the third, the reaction against previous pursuits, against departments of effort, from which the popular taste is turning. Metaphysics here furnish for us the most striking illustration.

The points affecting symmetry, to which we have drawn attention in the manner of education, were, first, object-teaching. This, while accompanied with important gains, has its dangers, concurrent with the great dangers of the age, that of an outside facile knowledge, as opposed to inside, symbolic truth. A second point in manner touched upon, was the increased tendency to practical corollaries, to the evolution of rules from principles, to tracing forces to their points of contact with daily interests. We only regret that philosophy, intrinsically the most fruitful of sciences, has not been so taught as to fully reveal the undergirding lines of force that it binds about our passing experiences. A last point pertaining to manner was the resort to artificial stimuli, especially in the later stages of training, instead of using more generously and boldly the natural incentives within our reach. We venture, in con-

clusion, on the expression of a more lively faith in nature, bipolar human nature, acted on freely by the electric currents of truth, playing between the positive and negative, the intuitive and reflective, the emotional and phlegmatic mind, female and male, in a method and measure that God has established, and to which he scarcely seems to have set those limits which we have allowed to grow up.

LECTURE III.

SCHOOL RECORDS.

BY ELBRIDGE SMITH.

EDUCATION is an inductive science ; it advances by observation and experiment. The most plausible theories, derived from *a priori* reasoning, from the constitution of our three-fold nature, must have borne the test of experience before they can be allowed a place in the science of human culture. We may, indeed, from the nature of the human mind, infer much respecting its true and normal development ; but mere inference is not science.

The gorgeous systems of Milton, Basedow, Rousseau, Bell, and Lancaster, of Fellenberg and Pestalozzi, have been established or rejected as they have been found, in successive years and in varied circumstances, most favorable to the capacities of the youthful mind. Authority in education, as in other sciences, is continually yielding to the results of observation and experience.

It is, then, a most important condition of progress in this science, that we perfect, as far as pos-

sible, our means of observation; that we study what to observe, and that the results of our observation should take some tangible and permanent form. The phenomena to be observed, classified, and recorded, are transpiring in every school-room every day and every hour. We come in contact with laws as important as those which bind the sweet influences of the Pleiades and guide Arcturus with his sons; and yet these laws are still waiting for that recognition which is necessary to their arrangement in a well-ordered system, or, in other words, to their expression in the form of exact science.

If I mistake not, there has never been, and there is not now, anything more wanted in our profession than correct and long-continued observation. The progress of education, like that of every other science, has been greatly hindered, because theory has been allowed to control observation; because mankind have been prescribing the laws of human development instead of diligently inquiring of nature what these laws are. In fact, we come to our work with so many prejudices and theories, that it is almost in vain for nature to display its laws in our presence. If those laws agree not with our theories, we are quite too apt to complain of the laws, and save the theories. The monk who refused to look through

the telescope of Galileo lest he might be convinced of the truth of the Copernican system of astronomy, is only a fair representation of the majority of men in all ages; and thousands who laugh or scoff at him are unconsciously his most enthusiastic followers and obedient disciples. For thousands of years, mankind had seen apples fall: they had fallen in the Academy of Plato, in the Lyceum of Aristotle, in the Porch of Zeno, and in the Garden of Epicurus; but they taught nothing to those theorists who were so busy in explaining the origin of all things that they found little time to learn true wisdom. But in the garden of Newton the fall of an apple taught the philosopher that

“The very law that moulds a tear
And bids it trickle from its source,
That law preserves the world a sphere,
And guides the planets in their course.”

Apples are falling in our school-rooms (much to our annoyance, sometimes, it is true) which are only waiting for the eye of a Newton that they may teach those laws which

“Live through all life, extend through all extent,
Spread undivided, operate unspent.”

Or, in other words, there are phenomena of intel-

lect, of heart, and body, constantly occurring before our eyes, which point to generalizations as grand, it may be, as those which have made illustrious the names of Newton and Faraday. I know very well that there are those (and their number is not small) who delight to sneer at the sphere of the teacher's action, and who regard it as narrow, cribbed, and confined. But that sphere is as broad as the material and spiritual creation of God.

"No pent-up Utica contracts our powers."

And do we not see human nature under circumstances most favorable for determining the laws which govern it? We see it before it has become hardened or warped by habit and custom; we see it in those stages in which the naturalist has toiled most successfully to detect the laws of the vegetable kingdom. It is a common remark that there is nothing to record in the work of the school-room, nothing there worthy of history; and we find, accordingly, that there are no records worthy of the name.

I took up, the other day, in the Boston Athenæum, a handsome volume, just published, — the history of one of the towns in this commonwealth — a town whose name will forever occupy one of the most prominent pages in American history. I turned over the leaves of this volume with great eagerness, for I was no stranger to the town or

its inhabitants. I found that a hundred pages had been given to the minutest details of a skirmish in which eight hundred British veterans had routed sixty militia-men, and shot eight of them. I read the narration with intense interest, not because it was new (for I had learned it on my father's knee, before I could read history; it was one of those contests which will stand in history with Thermopylæ, Cressy, and Agincourt), but to see if the historian had gleaned any new facts from a field which had been so thoroughly searched. From the long details of the fight, I turned to the chapter on education, in which I felt a personal interest. This battle-field had been my playground in my schoolboy days, and I was impatient to see the names of my teachers, with some notice, at least, of their educational history. But I was disappointed. The school once so famous in Middlesex was not even mentioned, and the days of its glory were as if they had never been, so far as this historian is concerned. In my disappointment, I laid aside the volume, not without a feeling of sadness, when I thought of the labors and sacrifices of my teachers, which in the space of a quarter of a century had fallen into oblivion. The words of Milton came to mind:—

“Alas! what boots it, with incessant care,
To tend the homely, slighted shepherd's trade,

And strictly meditate the thankless Muse ?
Were it not better done, as others use,
To sport with Amaryllis in the shade,
Or with the tangles of Neëra's hair ?”

But my spirits revived when I thought that it was
only a few rods from where —

“The embattled farmers stood,
And fired the shot heard round the world,”

that the first normal school in America was established. Yes, thought I: it was under the same roof and in the same room in which I learned the elements of Latin and Greek grammar, that the first normal instruction in the new world was given. This, I said, will certainly find a place in the history worthy of its importance. The name of Cyrus Pierce will certainly be mentioned as well as that of Jonas Parker. I took up the volume again, and found that the first normal school in the United States occupied, in the historian's pages, the space of about twenty lines. I found, indeed, the names of two teachers, Cyrus Pierce and Samuel J. May; but of their character as teachers, of the place which they occupied in the educational movements of the time, of the interior work of the school, the number of its pupils, its course of study, — for all these subjects the historian had not a word. I had recourse to Milton again, and read,

"Fame is no plant that grows on mortal soil,
Nor in the glistening foil
Set off to the world, nor in broad rumor lies ;
But lives and spreads aloft by those pure eyes
And perfect witness of all-judging Jove."

I concluded, from the historian's pages, that military glory compared with the culture of the human mind, in the ratio of about two hundred to one. Think not that I mean to imply that he gave too much space or too glowing eulogy to the more than Spartan valor of those "village Hampdens" who withstood not the petty tyrants of their fields, but the dread and incensed sovereign of a mighty empire, when he came, in his embattled hosts, to subdue them. Oh, no ! too much cannot be said in their praise. While the language we speak retains its meaning in the ears of men, let their names and their memories be cherished. But let there also be a place for the virtues and the achievements of those who, by their labors, have given permanency to the principles for which the patriot yeomen bled. Was it accident or a heavenly regard for the eternal fitness of things, that, on the very spot where Parker, Hadley, the Harringtons, Monroe, Muzzey and Brown sealed their devotion to their country with their blood, should rise the first institution exclusively consecrated to the training of American teachers ? Was it chance or

was it prophetic of what we now see going on in every city from the Potomac to the Rio Grande, that whatever soil is moistened with New England blood must bear a harvest of intelligence, freedom, and religion? I have dwelt upon this instance because it is a representative example. I have known many such. I was passing through one of the larger cities of this State a few years since, and found in a bookstore, in a handsome octavo, the history of that city brought down to the present time. I thought, at once, here will be something of interest in the history of education. I examined the contents, and soon found the page, or rather the third or half of a page, on which the educational history of that city was written. The clergymen, the lawyers, the physicians, the selectmen, the mayors, the sheriffs, the tythingmen, and the hog-constables (I believe), were all there, in all their official and heraldic glory; but not the name of a single teacher, not an intimation of the peculiar character and talents of those who had done so much in shaping the character of that city.

Do not think that I am complaining of these historians. They undoubtedly did their best with the materials at their disposal. They could not make bricks without straw; they could not write history without historic material, without records, — and such records were not to be found.

Go to our poor-houses, and you will find a careful record of the name, birth, and other important particulars of each inmate's history. Go to our jails, and you will find a similar record. Go to our state prisons, and you find quite a history of the person and character of each convict. Go to a hospital, and you find the name, age, disease, mode of treatment, and term of residence. Go to the navy, and you find all the particulars of the person of each sailor and marine. Go to the army, and you find the men, who it may be are to be shot in the first encounter, are gauged, measured, and weighed, sounded, tested, and proved, before they are thought fit marks for the Southern rifle or the Indian scalping-knife. Turn over the ponderous quartos that congressmen send us, and you will learn the state of the barometer and thermometer, the number, variety, types, and duration of diseases at all our frontier military posts. In short, judging from statistics, we may fairly conclude that, to render a man worthy of notice, to make his history or surroundings worthy of record, you must make him a *pauper*, a *rascal*, a *cripple*, a *madman*, or a *soldier*. The honest, sane, healthy, virtuous millions who do the work of this great hive of human civilization may plod on in obscurity: they are of little account.

I have said that it is a common remark, that

there is nothing worthy of sober, dignified history in the life of the school-room. There may be, indeed, it is thought, occasion simply to take down the names of the pupils; but this may be done in a hasty manner: you need not trouble yourself about the Christian names. If the name be Smith, it will be sufficient to write J. Smith, or if it be Brown, T. Brown; you have some little grammatical or mathematical accounts to keep with them for a few weeks or months, and J. Smith will be all you will need for the purpose; you will know who is meant by J. Smith and T. Brown, and, if anybody should have occasion to consult your record, it will be a nice little problem for him to solve, to make out the reference. He can readily determine whether it is John or James or Jeremiah or Josiah or Jedediah or Thomas or Timothy or Thaddeus or Theodore or Theophilus. If this J. Smith or T. Brown should become distinguished in science, art, or literature, and some knowledge were sought of his school-life it would be safe to take the best account of the half-dozen J. Smiths or T. Browns in your record, if your record should happen to be in existence. Or if his distinction should become manifest at the criminal court, it would be safe to take the worst of the half-dozen accounts recorded against the names of J. Smith and T. Brown: in

either case you can make out a good story for the Sabbath school. But there are some other things about Smith and Brown it would be desirable to know. Their grammatical and mathematical accounts may be bad and all your warnings and exhortations may not have developed a love of paradigms and formulas. You may have given Brown a serious lecture upon his neglect of binomial theorem; and he is now sitting at his desk in a meditative mood, thinking not of your lecture, but of something he has partially concealed behind his desk. You feel quite impatient, and approach Brown to see what is absorbing his mind to the neglect of the all-important binomial theorem. Brown is taken by surprise, and gives up, with some reluctance, some mechanical contrivance, which you have not time to examine, and direct Brown to stop after school. Brown stops after school, and you get a moment before school closes to examine his mechanics. You come to the conclusion that Brown is intent on making a steam engine, and that he is so earnest in his work that he carries parts of it in his pocket, and you now understand why he has been consulting all the works on engineering and mechanics in the library, while you have been so much troubled about Brown's knowledge of the binomial theorem. But you feel somewhat relieved to find that

Brown is not idle, and you deal somewhat gently with him after school. You restore to him his mechanics, and manifest some interest in his engine. Brown's countenance brightens, and he astonishes you by the extent and accuracy of his knowledge on the various forms of the steam engine. You bring a work upon the engine, which he has not seen, and caution him again not to neglect the binomial theorem. Brown improves greatly in his next recitation in algebra, though he is still making perfect chaos of coefficients and exponents.

Smith, too, has been troubling you all day; his desk has been the centre of attraction or repulsion; the boys have been curious and the girls fidgety, while Smith has been sober and evidently endeavoring to study. But there is a strange mystery about his desk, and you at last determine to solve it. You go to Smith's desk, and find, to your astonishment and dismay, that he has imprisoned there a good-sized snake, which he caught on his way to school and which he is carefully keeping to add to the collection which he is making in natural history. Smith is told to stop after school, and you find that he knows all about snakes, and though he loves to tease the girls with his specimens, he has no purpose whatever of disturbing the school. You remind him that he is quite apt to neglect

his Latin grammar and his Virgil. You ask him if he can give the scientific name of the snake he is preserving so carefully; yes, he replies with confidence, it is *chlorosōma vernālis*. O Smith! you exclaim, that will never do; you neglect your Latin so that no naturalist will ever understand you; it is *chlorosōma vernālis*; you must study your Latin more or you will be a laughing stock among scientific men. Smith gets a new idea. He had been laughed at by the boys and girls for his blunders in Latin, and he cared as little for their laughter as for the Latin; but it will never do for him to be laughed at by the zoölogists. Smith resolves to pay more attention to his Latin; not for the sake of the Latin, but for the sake of his snakes. He comes to his next recitation in Virgil with the confidence inspired by the consciousness of having honestly studied his lesson, and the hope of meeting your approbation. He is not to be caught in any more false quantities — not he. He reads the lines in the second book in which the deaths of Coracbus and Rhipeus are described. He reads, not without emotion, —

“Cedit et Rhipeus justissimus unus
Qui fuit in Teucris et servantissimus æqui,”

the final clause he renders — “and most careful of his *horse*.” This sets the whole class in a roar of

laughter, and Smith looks round in indignant amazement to see what can be the matter. You ask him the meaning of *æqui*, and he replies with confidence, *a horse, sir, a horse*. You finally make Smith understand the difference between the vowel and the diphthong, between *æqui* and *equi*, and commend him for his increased attention to his Latin. But while you have been going through with your trials with Smith and Brown, Jones has been delighting you by his diligence and success. His algebra is all right, his binomial theorem thoroughly demonstrated, his genitives, datives, and ablatives rightly disposed of; he knows all about Priam, Hector and Achilles, and you seize with eagerness upon an unusual and untried subjunctive which occurs in the lesson, to see if he can master it. He translates it with the ease and grace of a young Elmsley or Porson, and gives you the grammatical principle with readiness and accuracy. But how do Smith, Brown, and Jones stand in your school record. Jones is of course all right; he is at school every day, loves his work, and gets no checks in deportment. But Smith's *menagerie* and Brown's *machine shop* interfere with your school order, and bring down their standard in deportment. Smith's attendance is imperfect, for he has various raids to make into the several departments of the animal kingdom,

and Brown has occasionally an opportunity for a day's ride upon a locomotive. All these outside matters only make the lessons worse, and their account on the whole is bad. From attendance, conduct, and recitation you cannot make out much for Smith and Brown; but Jones is certainly destined for some great work in the world. Years pass away, and somehow or other Smith, Brown, and Jones have fought their way to distinction, and their biographies must be written, and your school-record (if it was not used to kindle the fire the next term after you left) is overhauled to find what these great men did at school. But alas! they were irregular in attendance, deficient in deportment, and execrable in recitations. The biographer, in despair, thinks over the old saws, "The child is the father of the man," "Train up a child" &c., "Whatsoever a man soweth," &c., and is almost ready to conclude that Solomon and Paul were humbugs. And yet a few words of explanation would have justified both Paul and Solomon, and shown that the words of the wise in all ages were as truly verified in the youth and manhood of Smith and Brown as in that of Jones.

I have traced these types of school-boy character, so common in all our schools, farther, I fear, than your patience has borne me. I have tried to give you a glimpse of what your own experience

has doubtless furnished you more vivid scenes of. But are not these and similar phenomena of school-life, worthy of something more than a passing notice? Does not the apparent waywardness of boys and girls, when rightly viewed, often indicate a craving for something which the school does not furnish, rather than that perversity of character which leads to vice and insubordination? May not these phenomena be brought within the range of a careful and truly philosophic induction?

Suppose that, at our meeting last year, we had agreed upon methods of observation, and certain points to which that observation should be directed, and suppose the results of those observations could be laid before this meeting. Suppose that we were all at work from year to year upon plans of observation, which, if not exactly the same, should be so far similar as to admit of comparison, and point at a tangible and practical result. Suppose that each grade of school, from the primary to the university, have its plans of observation thus marked out, and that these observations be made a matter of permanent record. Suppose these plans adjusted to every phase of culture attempted in our schools, and thus the various facts and phenomena of the school-room, from the stand-point of different observers and distant com-

munities, be brought to bear upon definite ends. These observations would of course be colored by the prejudices, the partialities, and the idiosyncrasies of the different observers, but the extent of these observations in the school-room, as in the laboratory or the observatory, would nevertheless enable us to reach the golden mean of truth. Suppose these observations to be continued year after year, can it be doubted that in this way most important results would be reached — that education would assume a more scientific and progressive character — that the teacher would rise from the mere empiric which he now too often is to the true inductive philosopher — from the mere drill-master to the educator.

It may seem, at first thought, that there is no scope, in the school-room of any grade, for this wide induction of which I have spoken. It may seem, that the most that can be done is rudely to classify the intellectual disparities, the moral obliquities, the social inequalities and the physical disproportions which make up the sum total of the school, so as to derive from it a decent amount of arithmetic, geography, or grammar, of Latin, algebra, Greek or French. To the superficial observer the school-room presents just this chaotic appearance. To the thoughtful mind, all these restless spirits are moving under the direction of a wise and beneficent law, —

"The discord, harmony not understood;
The seeming evil, universal good."

The power that cares for the falling sparrow, and numbers the hairs of your head, is guiding these active minds; the power that has given definite laws and properties to gross matter, has fixed no less certainly the laws of these spirits which

"When earth's no more, will still survive above,
And through the radiant files of angels move,
Or, as before the throne of God they stand,
See new worlds rolling from his spacious hand,
Where their adventures may be told and taught,
As we now tell how Michael sung or fought."

What greater chaos to the untaught mind than the sparkling vault above us? And chaos it was for six thousand years; peopled with gorgons and hydras and chimæras dire, motions unmeaning and contradictory, fearful sights and foreboding signs, blazing meteors and wandering comets, eclipses shedding disastrous twilight o'er half the nations, and with fear of change perplexing monarch, serried hosts rushing to battle. Two centuries of patient observation, induction, and generalization pass over this universal chaos. Tycho, Kepler, Galileo, and Newton, have lived and lo! these glorious heavens have laid aside their terrors; order comes out of confusion; the comet

comes no longer to terrify, but only to amuse and instruct us ; the flickering aurora no longer warns us of approaching battles, but gently sympathizes with the trembling needle in the compass-box ; descending meteors, though thick as autumnal leaves, trouble us only because they do not come when expected ; and the whole scenery of the firmament is no longer the conflict of angry gods, but the peaceful reign of order, wisdom, and love. And has God revealed to our patient inquiry the law which forms the dew-drop, binds the universe to its central sun ; made known the chemistry of Sirius and all the starry host ; and shall he not disclose to the same patient inquiry the laws of mind ? Shall not education, as well as astronomy, have her Kepler, her Galileo, and her Newton ?

Is not the world within us, with all its mysteries of passion, reason, motive, and will, to yield more fully its secrets, unfold its laws and order of development ? Shall man explore the material universe, and be forever ignorant of himself ?

But what is the present state of our schools in these regards ? Are they accumulating wisdom, by careful and extensive inductions ? Does every grade of school present its record of facts and the generalizations drawn from them ? Are these, from time to time, compared in different communities, and thus moulded into the form of exact sci-

ence? Have we anything in education compared to the exhaustive catalogues of our observatories? I think you will find few schools in this State, which have been in existence for twenty-five years, in which you will be able to determine even the names of the teachers. The most barren and superficial facts are not recorded. The school that is organized to-day for the first time, is as wise as that which has been taught for a century. We run the rounds of our courses of instruction, go through our *trivia* and *quadrivia*, and leave the work to our successors, substantially the same as we found it. In fact the teacher is the school. There is seldom, I fear, a life of the school distinct from the teacher; and the too general expectation is, that when a new teacher comes into a school, all is to be made new. As if the new proprietor of a printing house should begin by pitching all his cases into one promiscuous mass of *pi* in the centre of the office. He may desire a new disposition of his cases; he may have distinct plans of his own which he will desire to execute; but if wise, he will make the state of things which he finds the base of all his modifications and improvements. Suppose one should undertake to write the history of education in any one of our towns and cities for the last fifty years. Is it probable that he would be able to trace out, from existing

records, any well-defined policy? that he would be able to make out the features of a science, or find only a mass of facts connected by no apparent law of cause and effect?

Suppose, on the other hand, one should undertake to write the history of the cotton manufacture for the same period. He would find it a most interesting, though laborious undertaking. He would find two classes of facts, which we may designate as internal and external. The first would relate to improvements in machinery, every thing that relates to the perfection of the fabric made; while the second would pertain to the extension of the manufacture, the profits and the fluctuations of the markets.

There is, or ought to be; the same two classes of facts in education. It has its interior and exterior work. There is a class of facts connected with education, interesting to the general reader, and there is another class mainly interesting to the professional educator. The material for both these departments of history ought to be constantly accumulating. Every printed document belongs to one or the other of these departments of history. Every annual exhibition of a school has its distinctive feature, and its programme ought to be carefully preserved. Every daily order of exercises for the quarter or term ought,

in like manner, to be preserved as a part of the archives of the school. When you get abused in the newspapers, cut out the article and put it into your school scrap-book. Emulate the honesty of good old Oliver Cromwell, who told the painter of his portrait: "Paint me just as I am, scars, wrinkles, and all, or I will not pay you a cent." If possible, have all the original exercises of your annual exhibitions written out by their authors in their best style, and have them bound in a manuscript volume; they will tell more to the future antiquary or historian, than you can now imagine. With what intense interest will the historian of the next century turn over the school records and archives of the last ten years, if he can find them!

Think, for a moment, of the moral power derived, by the universities of Oxford and Cambridge, from their traditions and their history. It has been said, that the throne itself rests upon these two institutions. We see much that is evil in them,—much that we would wish to change; but we may learn from them a most important lesson: we may copy their virtues and shun their faults. What gives Winchester and Eton and Rugby and St. Paul's and Christ's Hospital and Harrow their vast influence over the minds of Englishmen? It is their traditions, their history, imperfect as it is, which bind the hearts of thou-

sands of alumni to them in such bonds of affection as make *alma mater* no figure of speech, but a sober reality. The same process is going on in our own country. Why do the two Phillips academies exercise so powerful an influence? It is their age, their traditions, their alumni, who are always telling us, "And so they did at Andover and Exeter."

On the banks of Charles River in Cambridge, stands the oldest university in the country. On the shore of Cayuga Lake, in New York, there will go into operation in a few weeks, perhaps, the best appointed university in the United States. Its funds, I think, are nearly equal to those of Harvard. Its president has been kidnapping, the past year, all over England and Europe. But can Cornell at once compete with Harvard in the moral power it will have over the country? No: not for years. The Harvard triennial is something more than a catalogue of names: it is a kind of moral endowment for the university. Its class reports, with all their *minutiæ* and *facetiæ*, its collections of photographs, its Hasty Pudding Club, with all its fond records and recollections, cannot be grown at Ithaca in a year, nor in fifty years. But Cornell University may lay her foundations deeper and broader than Harvard, even. She may get a library as good as Har-

vard's, and she may so record her experience that her growth shall be steady, rapid, and uniform.

But what are our public schools doing by way of foundation work? How are they binding to themselves the affections of the sons and daughters who are going forth annually from their halls? I fear that, in a majority of cases, you cannot obtain even a correct list of these graduates. Our public schools, in these regards, are kept very much as the toll-houses used to be on the Boston bridges. You paid your fare and no questions were asked, as to where you came from or whither you were going. So, in the school, it is quite too much the case that, if the appointed tasks are performed, you can go, and no friend to take note of your departure.

I stood, but a few days since, within the crumbling walls of one of those brick school-houses which may be found in thousands of New England school districts. It had done its work, and had already yielded a portion of its materials for the more commodious structure upon the opposite side of the way. Like Homer's Nestor, it had been the place of resort for the youth of that district, for two entire generations of boys and girls, and it had sheltered a part of the third. To the stranger, it showed no attractions; but to me it was more than interesting, — it was sacred. No

Jew ever visited the ruins of the Holy City with more affection and veneration, than I experienced as I stood upon the threshold of the old school-room, where I had passed the happiest hours of my life. Talk of Parthenons and Colosseums, of Ephesian temples and Egyptian pyramids, there was something about this humble ruin more touching than all the splendors of the Acropolis, or all the mysterious wonders of the valley of the Nile.

I gave myself up, for a few moments, to the impressions of the spot. My old school-mates came thronging back to the seats which they occupied thirty years ago. Yes, there they were in form and feature, in dress and behavior, just as when I studied and played with them in the fairest and freshest hours of life. There was Sarah and Mary and Martha and Rachel and Priscilla and Caroline and Abigail and Maria and Lucinda, and there, too, were Maynard and Ephraim and Josiah and Edward and Milton, and Willard and Simon and Jackson; they were all there, — distinguished farmers, successful merchants, exemplary matrons, upright citizens; like old Æson, had renewed their youth, and seemed as ready to engage in a spelling match, or in a tussle for the head of the class, as their children are to-day. There came, also, the well-remembered forms of the teachers, from the professor's chair,

from the sacred desk, and from all the spheres of honorable action. And there sat the committee, more dignified, more affectionate, than I have since known; the young lawyer (since risen to the chief-justiceship of one of our higher courts), whom we all so much loved and feared — loved for his courtesy and kindness, his accurate scholarship, and his devotion to the interests of sound learning; and feared lest we might fail in some demands which he might make upon us; the reverend chairman, the very impersonation of Goldsmith's village clergyman, —

“Who tried each art, reproved each dull delay,
Allured to brighter worlds and *led the way.*”

How vividly did the words that he uttered, and the tones in which he spoke them, come again to my ears, as they used to at the close of our short winter terms, after the examination had continued until the shades of evening compelled a pause, the solemn silence that pervaded that crowded school-room, broken only by the sobs and sighs of those who grieved that the hour of parting had come, while the voice of prayer arose to invoke blessings upon parents, teacher, and pupils! Ah! yes, there were whole histories and biographies crowding into my mind at that moment. While engaged in these musings, there stood by my side an

aged man of more than fourscore years, who told me the whole story of the school-house; how the bricks were brought, how the labor was contributed by men long since departed. His recollection went back to the previous house, in which he was taught, and his mind was as busy there as mine was in the one before me. But, thought I, what results does this house transmit to its successor? What records did it receive from its predecessor? From the training of three or four generations, what permanent lessons have been learned, or what treasures gathered for the educator or the antiquary? Nothing, literally nothing. Yet, on this spot, had been going on, for a century, a moral and mental development, over which angels had bent with anxious interest. The same laws of thought had been working here, the same passions, the same conflicts between opposing motives, the same struggles, and the same triumphs, as in those halls which have a world-wide fame. Can we doubt, for one moment, that a proper record of all the facts worthy of notice in New England district schools, from the time of their establishment, would be one of the most valuable contributions to the history of education, and at the same time furnish the requisite data for its improvement. Where or when in the world's history have so great results followed from causes

apparently so inadequate? What is the secret of this great success? Is it not worthy of our philosophy to inquire? Have not many of us, fellow-teachers, had occasion to remark the greater amount of labor required to accomplish the same results in city schools, as compared with similar schools in the country? Have we never rejoiced when we have seen a stray country boy find his way to our school-rooms unskilled in all the tricks of school-life, and perhaps attracting, by his greenness, the ridicule of his mates? and have we not seen that boy grapple manfully with his persecutors, and stand, in a few weeks or months, a moral and intellectual victor where he had been greeted with scorn and derision? Be assured there is a meaning in these phenomena; and if the records of our country schools had been wisely and carefully kept, they would contribute quite as much to the solution of the great problems in education, as the more imposing institutions in our cities.

A school is, or ought to be, a thing of life, a growth, an institution; sending forth its roots into the surrounding community, and deriving from it, in turn, nourishment and support. A school should consist not merely of the scholars that may be found at any one time within its walls: it has a claim upon all who have ever been connected

with it, and they in turn have a claim upon it. Our colleges are getting wiser in this matter. *Phi Beta Kappa*, with all its scholarship, is giving way to the claims of those who were not high scholars, and have yet shown themselves *true men*. Find you a man who really cares nothing for his school or his college, that man

"Is fit for treasons, strategems and spoils;
Let no such man be trusted."

And find you a school that, like the ostrich, does no more for its scholars than to carry them through the routine of study, and then leaves them to the care of the world, be assured the teachers or guardians of that school are blind to some of its highest and tenderest interests.